Southern Sta... Library
Sorin of Indiana & Dan

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. NO. 109, NO. 21 NEW YORK, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1943 NUMBER 1512

Soldiers and Politicians

We have seen another week during which, as usual, things went far better in a military sense than they did in a political one. The Russian advance continued to achieve spectacular successes; the last north-south rail line was broken in western Russia, according to the pre-war boundary of that country. (Constantin Oumansky, Russian Ambassador to Mexico, made a speech, however, apparently claiming as Russia's western boundary the line established in the Russo-German partition of Poland shortly after the beginning of the war.) In the southwest Pacific progress was satisfactory. Despite extravagant Japanese claims of success, it seemed certain that her losses, especially of ships at Rabaul, were severe and far in excess of our own.

In Italy our progress was slow and costly, but this had been expected, and military men pointed out that the Germans engaged in fighting there were very much needed on the Russian front. Almost the only bad news, in a military sense, came from the island of Leros, in the eastern Mediterranean, held by the British but attacked in force by the Germans. Questions were being asked in London as to why the British had landed on several of the Dodecanese Islands in such weak strength that they were soon outnumbered by the Germans. The situation was especially important because the events happened before the eyes of the Turks. The Allies are bringing strong pressure to bear on Turkey either to join the war or to grant us bases for an attack on the Balkans.

The removal of General Giraud as co-chairman of the French Committee of National Liberation was accompanied by a reorganization of the committee with more seats, and stronger influence, for the Underground. It was a shattering blow to the American State Department, which had supported Giraud from the beginning. He remained, of course, in charge of the French army, estimated at 300,000 men. The French Committee thus moved somewhat to the Left; but this fact was hardly apparent in the ruthless suppression of the independence agitations in Lebanon. A complicated game of power politics is being played there, with the French, the British, the Arab nationalist movement, and no doubt enemy propaganda, all participating.

The New York Times says Premier Badoglio has announced that he will retire from office as soon as the Allies reach Rome. All things considered, it would be better news if he and the King would both retire immediately, and let liberated Italy be run by someone for whom the Italians, and the rest of the world, can feel genuine respect.

On the domestic front, Congress continued to act almost as badly as it possibly could. It fought bitterly against subsidies to keep down food prices, preferring to rob the consumer of perhaps fifteen billions rather than to spend a billion on subsidies. The tax bill had been whittled down from the ten billion the Treasury asked, to a disgraceful two billion. The poll tax, one of the strongest aids to enemy propaganda throughout the world, was again up for consideration, and again a little group of Southern Senators proposed to fili-

CONTENTS

The Week 699
Editorials
Why Not an Italian Republic? 702
A Blow to Catholicism 703
Next Steps for the Senate 704
The Insurance Lobby at Work 705
General Articles
Punishing the War Criminals . Sheldon Glueck 706
Fascism in the Argentine . Heinz H. F. Eulau 709
American Prisons Go to War . Maury Maverick 712
Britain and Post-War Aviation . . . . . Michael Young 714
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 716
Newsreel . . . . . Manny Farber 717
A Communication . . Ernest C. Oberholtzer 717
The Bandwagon 718
Correspondence 719
Books in Review
Port of Refuge . . . . Malcolm Cowley 722
Herbert Matthews' Italy . Gaetano Salvemini 723
Fiction Against Fascism . . . Harvey Breit 724
Exiles on Exiles . . . Nicola Chiaromonte 725
The War Years . . . Richard H. Rovere 726
Struggle and Song . . . David T. Bazelon 726
A Reader's List 727

ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879
PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1943, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y.
PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

buster against it, defying the majority principle and ignoring the danger of such action to the war effort. Looking at Congress, one could only conclude that if our political representatives were only as good as our soldiers, this would be a wonderful country indeed.

Catholic Bishops and the Peace

Almost alone among responsible men, the ten Bishops and Archbishops of the Administrative Board of the National Catholic Welfare Council have questioned the Moscow Pact. After saying that the Declarations open the way to international coöperation and thus represent a step in the right direction, they continue: "They do not, however, dispel the fear that compromises on the ideal of the Atlantic Charter are in prospect. Some things these documents imply by statement and more significantly still by omission leave an uneasiness in minds intent on peace with justice to all."

This is vague language, and one can hardly comment on the warning without further specifications. What do the Bishops mean? Are they afraid of the equality of status which the Pact implies for the Soviet Union? Do they have misgivings about the future boundaries of Poland, traditionally a Catholic state? Do they object to independence for Austria? Does the declaration on Italy give them pause on account of its clear support of anti-fascism and democracy? Do they see the vanishing of a dream of a series of Southern-European Catholic states on the pattern of Franco's Spain, in which the Church may exercise temporal power? Let them speak out plainly.

On one point the Bishops are clearly in error. They speak, they say, "as pastors of soul and teachers of religion," and "do not enter the domain of statesmanship." But if ever anything concerned mundane political affairs and dwelt in the realm of statesmanship, it was the Moscow Conference. Catholics are not bound to follow Church dignitaries when they deal with such matters, and many will not do so. Non-Catholics may oppose the conclusions without subjecting themselves to the charge of "anti-Catholic bigotry." The Bishops are here speaking from the same platform as any important commentator on international affairs.

Thank You for Nothing

The Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, asked by the Treasury to submit a measure increasing taxes by a minimum of $10,500,000,000 in order to avoid inflation and reduce the post-war debt, has submitted one that will raise about $2,000,000,000. It expects the taxpayers to be pleased by this concession. We are taxpayers, but we are also consumers, and we are not pleased. When the cost of living rises and the other disastrous consequences of inflation ensue, we shall remember the members of the Ways and Means Committee, and any Representatives who vote for this bill. We shall be careful not to mark our crosses or pull our levers opposite their names.

Slump in Wall Street

We do not know whether it is more comic or tragic that the stock market should have wiped out $2,000,000,000 in values in a single session a few days ago. Quite possibly the market may have been higher than was justified by the facts; but the collapse came, not because of this but because the operators—wrongly, in all human probability—thought the war in Europe was about to come to an end. What an ironic commentary on all the talk by these same men about "free enterprise"—by which they mean enterprise that is far from free, being rigidly controlled in their favor. They object to having the government do business—but they drop $2,000,000,000 in values at the prospect that the government may soon withdraw its operations. They insist they are not making unreasonable profits—but the market crashes wildly at the prospect that these profits may be suspended. They talk glowingly about the brave new world after the war—but they apparently have no confidence that in such a world they can earn a reasonable profit on their money, even though their only competition will be government securities whose going rate is a little over three percent at most. Brave new world, indeed!

The Lebanon

The political crisis in Lebanon once more underlines the need for an early clarification of the post-war status of the colonial peoples. The prevailing uncertainty in this respect is responsible for the unilateral and impatient action of the Lebanese parliament in voting to terminate the mandate as much as the equally short-sighted and arbitrary measures of the local French authorities in dissolving the parliament, arresting government leaders and declaring martial law. It is unlikely that the newly constituted, liberal French Committee in Algiers will recede from the earlier promise of granting independence to Lebanon. But it rightly points out that ending the mandate is a matter of joint decision by the League of Nations or its successors. The Lebanese question is further complicated by the rift between the Christian majority which wants complete autonomy, and the Moslem minority which prefers inclusion in an Arab Union now sponsored by Great Britain. There is much irony in the report that Lebanese leaders have appealed for intervention to the British, whose colonial record hardly justifies such trust. The undue interest in the events in Lebanon manifested by Egypt's Prime Minister Mustapha Nahas Pasha, a Pan-Arabian spokesman, suggests that the unrest in Lebanon may well have been inspired by Pan-Arabian elements with British blessing. The purpose of this intrigue would be to take advantage of the mistakes of the French in handling the Lebanon

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

situation and embarrass them in their dealings with the Arabs in North Africa. It is obvious that only international action can offer a satisfactory settlement of the Lebanese and similar colonial questions.

UNRRA

The meeting of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, now in progress at Atlantic City, is setting some historic precedents. Here is the first body set up by the United Nations that is a real going concern. The delegates include representatives of 33 United Nations, 10 associated ones, and the French Committee of National Liberation. Under the chairmanship of former Gov. Herbert Lehman of New York State, the conference is in grim earnest about its task of providing emergency care for the inhabitants of areas liberated from Axis rule. It is hoped that the cost can be kept down to something like two and a half billion dollars, of which the United States will be expected to contribute one billion or more, on a basis of its national income. The smaller nations, which in advance expressed the fear that they would be only puppets of the Big Four—the United States, Great Britain, Russia and China—have obtained some modification of procedure, and less is heard of their fear. UNRRA may well prove the modest beginning of very important things to come.

Spain Is Caught Flatfooted

For the prize mess of nonsense of the week, we nominate the Spanish explanation of Franco's message of friendship to the head of the Japanese-Quisling government of the Philippines. Apparently the Spaniards involved in the matter were too stupid to realize in advance that the United States would object to this message, which tied Spain once more to the fascist axis. When both public and private sources in this country took exception, Spain issued an explanation which was unsatisfactory only in that it failed to explain anything. They were just being friendly, the Spaniards said. They didn't intend the message to have political implications. Oh dear, no. Meanwhile a mass of evidence has been unearthed that Spanish ships are smuggling precious war materials into Europe for Hitler's benefit; that some of the goods we sell to Spain are passed along to Hitler, who needs them badly; that the Spanish soldiers fighting in Russia have never been withdrawn, as the Americans were led to believe, but are being incorporated, whether they like it or not, in the German army.

Too Much Good News

Now that the war is going well on nearly all fronts, this may be a good moment to observe that it is being overplayed in the daily press. We see regularly a good many newspapers; we believe that the ones we see are a fair sample of the entire country, and almost without exception, they exaggerate good news and minimize the communiqués when they are bad. Even the Russian advance, magnificent as it has been, does not compare with the accounts of it in the papers, which twenty times in succession reported the German morale smashed, the retreat become a rout and hundreds of thousands on the point of being taken prisoner. Not once did these statements prove justified. Usually the headlines are worse than the text; and usually afternoon papers are worse than morning ones. The excuse generally given is that the public won't buy papers without optimistic headlines, and as to this, there are two comments. First, careful studies have shown it is not true, and second, in view of the newsprint shortage, no paper should want to increase its circulation at present. Many papers are asking their readers to share copies with their neighbors. Probably what is needed is a conference of all the papers in each city and a common agreement to try to be a little more honest, since everyone concedes that false optimism, engendered by the press, is doing grave damage to home-front war activities. The radio—whose sins are often heavy—should, of course, be included in any such agreement. Isn't this a job for the American Society of Newspaper Editors?

Subsidies or More Inflation?

Labor has started its drive to crack the Little Steel formula for wage stabilization. The administration's last chance to save its stabilization program from complete wreckage lies in winning its subsidy fight in Congress in time to show labor that it at last means business on

How's *Your* I. Q.?
Stan MacGovern in The New York Post

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

price control as well as wage control, and thus win back labor support.

So far, of course, the farm bloc and profiteer lobbies have appeared to be away out in front with their campaign to repeal all consumer food subsidies. Some considerable opposition to these inflation forces is now forming in the House, however. Eight members of the Committee on Banking, which considers price-control questions, have issued a minority report opposing the Steagall bill introduced by their chairman, which would abolish payment of consumer food subsidies after December 31. These eight Democrats point out again that repealing subsidies would mean a price jump of from four to twenty percent on more than twenty-four items. They urge a compromise that will prevent the breakdown of the present limited price-control system.

Some Alternatives

The President has been informed by his leaders that both Houses of Congress will probably vote for the repeal of subsidies unless an acceptable compromise basis can be found. Many such possibilities have already been introduced in bill form. For example, Rep. Mike Monroney of Oklahoma is drafting an amendment to the pending Commodity Credit Corporation bill to authorize a flat amount for subsidies on condition that the Little Steel formula for wage control continues in effect. "I don't think the country is fully alert to the fact, but so far as inflation is concerned, we are living on borrowed time," Monroney says. "Just as sure as consumer subsidies are repealed and living costs are allowed to shoot up, wages will break through as well. We've got to hold both, and this is one way of doing it."

It is considered certain that the President will veto the CCC bill if it contains a subsidy-repeal clause. In that case, supporters of the administration program in the House do not think that the inflation forces will be able to muster sufficient strength to repass the bill over the veto.

The Poll Tax Again

When the anti-poll-tax resolution was about to be reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee, a resolution favoring a constitutional amendment prohibiting a poll tax, as a prerequisite for voting in a federal election, was urged as a substitute.

The introduction of this proposal amounts to an extension of the threatened filibuster, for there is no possibility in the world of abolishing the poll tax through constitutional amendment in any reasonable time.

The first motion to substitute the amendment for the bill failed of passage, but the danger is not past. It is still important to commit your Senator to voting for cloture on this measure. And in those cases where Senators cannot agree to go along on the cloture vote for immediate political reasons, it is imperative that they be persuaded against participating in the impending filibuster.

Butter or Nothing

The long-drawn-out battle for the freedom of people to eat oleomargarine if they want to has gone another round, and this round, as usual, went to the dairy section of the farm bloc. Groups like the National Coöperative Milk Producers' Federation and the Dairymen's League never relax their defenses against the admittance of margarine manufacturers into the sacred free-enterprise system.

Some time ago, Representative Fulmer of South Carolina, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, introduced a bill to lift federal taxes and restrictions which discriminate against the sale of margarine. He was reflecting the sensible view that since the war makes it impossible for us to produce as much butter as consumers want to purchase, the thing to do is to increase the supply of low-cost subsidies. Several Iowa college professors who recently ventured the same opinion lost their jobs as a result of the wrath of dairymen trustees, who disagreed. Representative Fulmer's bill met with the same treatment. As soon as Fulmer was ordered by his physician to go to Florida for a rest, the committee voted to pigeonhole their chairman's bill by a vote of 14 to 11.

Why Not an Italian Republic?

IN THE EYES of a simple-minded American, it is a curious business for his government, the leading exponent of republicanism in the world, to be desperately scheming and contriving to save monarchies in other nations. He is perfectly willing to admit that we should not, in a crusading spirit, impose our institutions on other peoples who do not want them, but what we have been doing in Italy looks far more like an attempt to impose other institutions on people who want ours.

It would be hard to imagine a royal family more discredited at home and abroad than the House of Savoy. The King has never been a strong and popular figure, and he not only consented to the assumption of power by the hated Fascist regime, but was implicated in its subsequent measures. Yet we began our influence on domestic affairs in Italy by paying compliments to him. Doubtless, military expediency prompted this course while the surrender was being negotiated. But after this necessity was over we seem to have been looking around for some other representative of the family who could be installed on the throne, in spite of the fact that Italian opponents of fascism are far from being fervent supporters of royalty. The Crown Prince being obviously unacceptable, we appear to have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

considered various ladies, and now are talking about a six-year-old boy, for any of whom a regency would have to be established.

The chief argument for a monarchy seems to be the so-called "principle of legitimacy." That is, in brief, that the political and psychological welfare of a people requires that there be no sharp break, unsanctioned by law or custom, in a regime to which loyalty has traditionally been attached. This regime, it is argued, is a powerful symbol, whether it be in itself monarchist or democratic, and its rejection may lead to domestic violence and foreign war.

It may be admitted that there is truth in this position under certain circumstances: for instance, great damage might be done in Britain, Holland or the Scandinavian nations by upsetting their respective monarchies. Furthermore, it is not necessary to do so, since they have succeeded in adapting themselves to democracy without any violent break in tradition. But one doubts whether we or the inhabitants of these countries would feel the same way about it if their kings had behaved as did Victor Emmanuel and their Prime Ministers had been like Mussolini. In that case there would not be much loyalty left for the symbol, and the thing most fervently desired might be a break with tradition.

It may be worth remembering that two of our most cherished allies are countries in which just such breaks with tradition have occurred in recent times (not to speak of our own break with King George III). It would be hard to point out more traditional regimes than the House of Romanov or the last Chinese dynasty, yet what gave these peoples new life and strength was the overthrow of both these legitimacies and the establishment of the Soviet Republic and the Republic of China. Of course revolutions involve turmoil, uncertainty and sacrifice, and not everything has gone smoothly in these nations. Yet who would want the old regimes back?

Furthermore it can scarcely be argued that the tradition of monarchy is and must remain stronger than that of republicanism in the nation of Mazzini and Garibaldi, to say nothing of the ancient republic of Rome. Mussolini himself, who in the past has made much capital out of Roman glory, called his new "government" a fascist republic. Though he is out forever and we have no admiration for his ideas, it must be admitted that he has known how to appeal to Italian emotions in the past; apparently he stole a propaganda march on us by becoming a republican while we legitimate republicans were paying court to a discredited monarchy.

No doubt some sort of interim arrangement which can preserve domestic tranquillity is necessary until the fighting is over and our armed forces can withdraw. Italy is not yet ready for democratic national elections. Nevertheless about half the area of the country is liberated, and the part which remains to be liberated contains the democratic northern industrial regions. If there must be a regency, why not a regency for the Italian people instead of for a small boy? Why not assume at the start that the Italian people want and will create a republic, leaving them free later to reject this assumption if they wish, instead of assuming that they want a monarchy when we have good reason to believe they want no such thing?

A Blow to Catholicism

DR. FRANCIS MC MAHON has been dismissed from his post at Notre Dame University and this fact seems to us a disaster of the first magnitude to the Catholic Church. Dr. McMahon is one of the two or three best known and most respected Catholic laymen in the United States. He is a stanch democrat who has for years publicly fought for a policy of no compromise with fascism. He has wanted this country to coöperate on a realistic basis with Russia. He has opposed the fascist Franco in Spain and the fascist Mussolini in Italy.

There is no pretense that Dr. McMahon was derelict in his duties at Notre Dame. It is no disrespect to his eminent colleagues on the faculty there, to say that he is the only man at Notre Dame with a national reputation, outside the narrow bounds of specialized learning. Admittedly, he has been dismissed for one reason only, that he is an anti-fascist. The explanation is given that the public tended to assume that Dr. McMahon spoke as an official representative of the university and that his attitude was a controversial one on political subjects. We do not believe that the public made any such confusion, and we don't think President Hugh O'Donnell has any evidence to that effect. No doubt he received letters from Catholics complaining about Dr. McMahon, but you may be sure that they complained because the writers are pro-fascists and for no other reason. Dr. McMahon did everything possible to make it clear that he was expressing his own views alone. If this effort did not work in his case, it will not work in any other. No professor in a Catholic institution will dare henceforth to express faith in democracy, on fear of dismissal. It is easy to imagine what kind of spineless yes-men would be left on the faculty of any Catholic institution if such conditions prevailed very long.

Dr. O'Donnell in his comment on the dismissal of Dr. McMahon says not a word about the merits of the political issues that are involved. He says he was forced to "accept the resignation"—a far from candid statement about a man he has fired—because of a mounting tide of letters of protest. Does Dr. O'Donnell mean to say that no professor is safe if enough letters are written (or induced to be written) against him? Just where

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is the exact numerical point at which a university president feels he must turn and run with the herd?

Apparently the rule that was applied to Dr. McMahon works in one direction only. There are professors in Catholic universities who speak and write constantly in favor of Franco and Mussolini, against Russia and in general on behalf of fascism. These men certainly commit the institutions they represent quite as much as Dr. McMahon has ever done. Yet no one has ever heard of one of these gentry being dismissed because his views were embarrassing to the institution.

The liberals have a particular cause for regret that Notre Dame will in future be a happy hunting ground for Coughlinites and Francoists. In commenting in the past on the political actions of the Catholic Church that were disturbing to non-Catholics, we have often made the point that the Church is not a monolithic body, that there are liberals and conservatives within its ranks and that it is the duty of non-Catholic liberals to bring what aid they can to the forces of enlightenment and progress inside the Church. Whenever we have advanced an argument of this kind, we have invariably received a number of letters all of which said in effect: "You are deceiving yourselves about the Church. There is no room for liberalism within it; when the pinch comes, the Catholic liberals will be discarded." Actions like that of Dr. O'Donnell strongly tend to confirm this pessimistic view. They tend to give the lie to those who say that the Church has enough vision to change with the changing times, and to confirm the view of those who argue that Catholicism is the inveterate foe of progress. That is why the McMahon case seems to us to be a blow—and a heavy one—at the Church itself.

Next Steps for the Senate

THE MAJORITY of the Senate, which sincerely wishes to see this nation take its proper leadership in the formation of international peace machinery, is still relaxed and glowing from the success of Secretary Hull at the Moscow Conference and their own success in the passage of the amended Connally resolution by such a large margin. A few of the leaders of this group, however, are already far along with their plans for the next phases of our foreign-policy fight.

To say that the resolution finally passed by the Senate still does not lay down a definite foreign policy for us is in no way a belittlement of that genuinely progressive move. A careful reading of The Congressional Record for the days of the Senate debate reveals that a surprisingly large number of Senators took pains to place their personal interpretations of the legislation in the record and that many of the interpretations are at sharp variance with the generally accepted views of what was agreed to. Men like Vandenberg, Taft, Millikin, Wiley, Wherry, Nye and Brooks did all they could to cloud the crucial issues in this way. On the basis of their speeches, it seems fair to predict that the question of the "sovereignty of free and independent nations" and an "international police force" are slated to become the 1943 equivalent of the famous Lodge Reservations of 1919. These men show no particular alteration in their thinking because of what happened at Moscow. For that matter, they show little alteration in their thinking because of anything that has happened, anywhere in the world, in the last four years. The character of the discussion indicates that they may make very grave trouble if and when the Senate is asked to validate, in the form of treaties, some of the fruits of Moscow.

To meet this threat, the Pledge for Peace Committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Owen J. Roberts, has renewed its drive for signers of the eight-point pledge sponsored by its distinguished members. Two points of the pledge attack the new "reservations" of the former isolationists: "Five, that each member nation of the world organization shall give up forever the sovereign right to commit acts of war against other nations; Six, that the authority of the world organization shall be made effective and irresistible by the establishment of an international police force." Mr. Justice Roberts has stated the sovereignty question very clearly for his Pledge Committee and for all those who support a strong world organization: "The last and most prevailing objection [to world organization] is that people of the democracies, and especially the people of the United States, will never consent to surrender any part of the national sovereignty. If this objection be valid, that ends the discussion. We may as well then throw up our hands and let the world roll on into chaos."

In the recent foreign-policy debate, the most frequent warning was that approval of the Connally resolution or of the amended Connally resolution in line with the Moscow Conference, was not to be taken as subsequent approval of any treaty arrangement concluded by the executive. In fact, the tenor of many Senators' remarks was that they were voting for the pending resolution principally because they were coming up for reëlection next year and there seemed to be considerable pressure from their states for international collaboration, but that they expected to be free agents again by the time the peace treaty came up for ratification and that then they would not be so tractable to these ideas.

Because of these disturbing undercurrents, Senator Gillette and Senator Pepper are individually introducing measures designed to remove the constitutional requirement of a two-thirds vote of the Senate to approve a treaty arrangement. Probably this is the ground upon which the next foreign-policy fight in the Senate is to take place. A first step to clear the ground for fair fight-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Southern State Normal School Library

ing is to dispose of the outmoded and undemocratic two-thirds rule. Pepper and Gillette can count on considerable support for their measures.

The real fear among those younger, vigorous Senators who led the fight for a strong Senate foreign-policy resolution is that the sweeping public support which massed behind them in that first round is melting away into a complacent satisfaction over the small victory. We are now committed to "a general international organization," yes, but what kind, with what kind of enforcement machinery and what kind of individual sacrifices of national rights? Those questions will be debated in our Senate in the coming months. We shall lose this, our second chance, as we lost our other chance in 1919, unless we can make the Senate know what we will give and do to get a world organization which can enforce peace for the future.

The Insurance Lobby at Work

CONGRESS once again is on the point of demonstrating its lack of concern for the American consumer. This time it is the holder of an insurance policy who is being kicked around in order that insurance companies may continue to engage in monopolistic practices and to peg their prices at a highly profitable level. The Senate is about to take up the Bailey-Van Nuys bill declaring that it is the intent of Congress that the regulation of insurance—all insurance—remain solely within the jurisdiction of the states and that insurance not be subject to the federal anti-trust laws. In other words, Congress is about to consider a bill which would extend to the insurance companies a privilege not granted any other business.

The zeal with which the Senate is acting to protect the companies from the federal statutes is something marvelous to behold. It shows how the Senate can distort the democratic process, for surely representatives of the people might be expected to protect us from the high rates charged by the insurance companies, rather than the companies from the law. The reason for the speed is not hard to discover. The Supreme Court has agreed to decide whether 198 stock fire-insurance companies and 27 individuals allied with the Southeastern Underwriters' Association are guilty of violating the Sherman and Clayton Anti-Trust Acts. It is a race between Congress and the Court, with Congress trying to head off the nine Justices from deciding the case on the facts and the law at hand.

A criminal action was taken against the Southeastern Underwriters' Association last year and the companies and individuals associated with it were charged with conspiracy to fix and maintain arbitrary and non-competitive rates on fire insurance in the Southeastern states and to monopolize trade and commerce in fire insurance. A federal district judge in Atlanta ruled in favor of the companies on the ground that insurance is not commerce. That question will now be decided by the Supreme Court if Congress would just give it a chance.

Fire-insurance companies all over the country are vitally interested, for the Southeastern is a test case. Friends of the insurance companies quickly rallied their strength in Congress, and the Senate is expected to pass the Bailey-Van Nuys bill without too much opposition. A powerful lobby has been operating in Washington and insurance agents and their friends all over the country have been writing to congressmen explaining that the poor policy-holder will be destroyed if the Bailey-Van Nuys bill is not passed before the Supreme Court disrupts the present profitable arrangements.

No organized pressure group has come forward to speak with any potency for the millions of policy-holders who would stand to benefit if the monopoly were broken.

Attorney General Biddle, in testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee, said that "the so-called board fire-insurance companies have not been above using improper and illegal methods to influence the actions of state officials and to deceive the United States courts." He explained that 116 of the companies indicted in the Southeastern are among the 142 companies which contributed several hundred thousand dollars "to bribe the superintendent of insurance of Missouri and others to recommend to the United States court the division in their favor of $10,000,000 impounded during litigation involving the reasonableness of fire-insurance rates charged by these companies in Missouri."

Senators Bailey and Van Nuys and their supporters shout "states' rights" and tell of the glories of insurance. And, with a few exceptions, the newspapers don't even report the story, which has been public business before the Senate Judiciary Committee for the last six weeks.

THE NEW REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

Managing Editor: THOMAS SANCTON

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

Assistant Editors: ELIZABETH HULING, GEORGE MAYBERRY, ISAAC ROSENFELD

Contributing Editors: H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, VARIAN FRY, JULIAN HUXLEY, ALFRED KAZIN, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Advertising Manager: E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Punishing the War Criminals

THE HISTORIC MOSCOW DECLARATION by England, Russia and the United States on the trial and punishment of Nazi war criminals is a strong and solemn promise to the world that the planners and executors of the blackest calendar of atrocities the civilized world has ever seen will be delivered over to justice. In inviting me, in September, to contribute an article on the problem of what to do with the Nazi-Fascist violators of the laws of warfare and of the criminal law of all civilized nations, the editors of The New Republic wrote that it seemed to them "the important thing is not retaliation so much as it is the establishment of peace in Europe and the prevention of a future war. Will the execution and imprisonment of Nazi leaders aid or deter these ends?"

The question cannot be answered conclusively; but the causes of war are so powerful and complex that the addition or subtraction of the factor of punishment or non-punishment of Axis leaders and their cold-blooded trigger-men and slaughterhouse-operators would probably make little difference in preventing a future war. That it might have some deterrent effect in making the Germans hesitate about further indulgence of their sadistic impulses in the present war was evidently believed by the representatives of the major powers at Moscow. In order to save some lives through deterrence, it was their duty to warn: "Let those who have hitherto not imbrued their hands with innocent blood beware lest they join the ranks of the guilty, for most assuredly the three Allied powers will pursue them to the uttermost ends of the earth and will deliver them to their accusers in order that justice may be done."

In planning the program of justice for the close of the present war, the history of the blindness and lameness of justice at the close of the First World War should not be forgotten.

Practically all the violations of the laws and customs of war we hear about today were committed many times over by the Germans during World War I. An inter-Allied commission, set up in 1919 by the Preliminary Peace Conference to inquire into violations of international law chargeable to Germany and her allies, summarized its findings in terms reminiscent of daily press dispatches telling of Nazi-Fascist atrocities:

> Murders and massacres, tortures, shields formed of living human beings, collective penalties, the arrest and execution of hostages, the requisitioning of services for military purposes, the arbitrary destruction of public and private property, the aerial bombardment of open towns without there being any regular siege, the destruction of merchant ships without previous visit and without any precautions for the safety of passengers and crew, the massacre of prisoners, attacks on hospital ships, the poisoning of springs and of wells, outrages and profanations without regard for religion or the honor of the individuals, the issue of counterfeit money . . . the methodical and deliberate destruction of industries with no other object than to promote German economic supremacy after the war, constitute the most striking list of crimes that has ever been drawn up to the eternal shame of those who committed them.

And what was done about this black scroll, last time?

Worn out by Germany's two-and-a-half year procrastination, the Allies agreed to permit the trial of some 900 of the most serious violators of the laws and customs of war by the German Supreme Court in Leipzig, under German law and German conceptions of justice. Only 12 offenders were actually tried. Of these, but 6 minor officers were convicted. The sentences for their bestial cruelties were: two of six months; one of ten months; one of two years; two of four years. With apparently official connivance, the four-year convicts soon escaped from jail. A German general, obviously guilty of mass atrocities, was acquitted amid the plaudits of the courthouse audience—including worthy burghers of the Weimar Republic—who showered him with flowers. Some 800 other cases which came to the attention of the *Reichsgericht* from other sources after the Allied "observers" had left Leipzig in disgust, were disposed of by order of the court discontinuing the proceedings, usually on the ground of "insufficient evidence." The Kaiser—far from backing up Lloyd George's election statements by conveniently permitting himself to be appended by the neck—lived to a ripe old wood-chopping age. Another star defendant on the Allied list, von Hindenburg, became the honored President of the Republic.

Did this happy ending of leniency prevent the successors of the Kaiser's planners of *Schrecklichkeit* and the whole black magic of Germany's peculiar conception of "military necessity" from trying again and trying on a larger and more perfidious scale than before? Inquire of the ghosts hovering over the charred ruins of Lidice and around the human abattoirs in the ghettos of Europe. Then consider whether the quality of mercy is not typically regarded by German militarists as a sure sign of weakness.

No; the question of the punishment of war criminals had better not be looked at primarily from the point of view of its effects in preventing or causing another world war in which the master race will once more—of course, in sheer self-defense against the horribly militaristic Belgians and Czechs and the degenerate *Franzosen*—kill and burn and boast.

But even if one knew quite certainly that the "go-and-sin-no-more" formula would materially enhance the chances of future peace, he should hesitate to sub-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scribe to it. There is peace and peace. There is the peace of the grave and the peace of the morally depraved. As the history of the events leading up to the present war has demonstrated, even peace can have too high a price set upon it. Let us once and for all have done with the continuous sickening genuflection before the militaristic problem-children of the world, in the perennially foolish belief that by offering them bribes of political and economic lollipops (especially at other people's expense), they may deign to decide that —perhaps—they will not again indulge in their amiable eccentricity of setting the world's house on fire. Let us expunge and disinfect, if we can, the whole foul record of Manchukuo, Ethiopia, Czecho-Slovakia, Munich and the rest. The world will never gain physical and moral strength by rebuilding on a moral garbage-heap. Obeisances of appeasement have brought us to the brink of inferno twice within a generation; we simply cannot afford to take the risk of toppling in altogether.

What we do with Axis-Fascist war offenders will perhaps have some influence on what their descendants try to do to us later on; but we would be the veriest fools if we depended for our future security on whether or not we do the mass-butchers the favor of whitewashing their crimes as they were last time.

The fundamental issue, then, is not the effect of our dealing with war offenders one way or another on Germany's and Japan's future conduct (leaving Italy aside as atypical in this bloody business). It is whether or not, in the affairs of civilized man, justice—however imperfect the man-made product may be—shall prevail. Let us not make the common mistake of thinking only or largely of the effect of United Nations' policy on the Germans and Japanese and ignoring the fact that the opinions and feelings, the very moral and mental health of the victim nations also deserve to be taken into account. Millions of innocent men, women and children have been insulted, tortured, slaughtered by heartless brutes. All too human emotions are brewing in the breasts of the survivors. Unless some socially controlled catharsis is permitted, unless these emotions are given play within orderly, legal channels, explosions will follow that will have dangerous reverberations for many years to come. Mental disorder, mob rule and vendettas will bestride the Continent. The aggrieved will feel hopelessly embittered and disillusioned, to see the jeering monsters who have hob-nailed across Europe and Asia looting, raping, torturing and slaying, permitted to go scot-free—and that, ironically, by the democratic crusaders for justice.

The thirst for vengeance is not a pretty thing; and normally it must be repressed in the interest of the social order. The situation *vis-a-vis* the Germans and Japanese is a large-scale and peculiarly electric one; but even here orderly justice by law is preferable to mob justice, at a time and in a situation when scientific theories of crime causation can obtain no hearing.

There is another psychological aspect to this, which concerns the Germans themselves. Unless there is a large-scale punishment of the extremist violators of the laws of man and God, many thousands of Germans will carry an awful burden of guilt within them that may well lead to dangerous expressions of psychopathology. Penitence, expiation—those deep-rooted ethico-psychologic strivings which the modern criminologist (including the writer) typically minimizes in dealing with local and ordinary crime and criminals—must play a potent role in the psychotherapy and the moral rehabilitation of the German people. The fact that there are millions of Germans who opposed the Nazis makes no difference: in the history of Germany it is quite typical for an extremely active short tail to wag an extremely docile long dachshund. The moral guilt is all-inclusive and organic.

Justice, however, does not mean unbridled vengeance. The malefactors should be tried by orderly processes of law. The problems involved in planning justice are enormously complex; but they are not insoluble if imagination is permitted as much scope as outworn legal technicality and precedent.

1. As to arrest and detention of the accused, the statesmen at Moscow wrought well in providing that "at the time of granting any armistice to any government which may be set up in Germany, those German officers and men and members of the Nazi Party who have been responsible for or have taken a consenting part in the above atrocities, massacres and executions will be sent back to the countries in which their abominable deeds were done in order that they may be judged and punished according to the laws of these liberated countries and of the free governments which will be erected therein." Last time, the doing of justice was postponed until after the peace treaties were signed; the evidence was "cold," the people were weary and anxious to get back to "normalcy"; and the legal status was not one of war but of peace—something that involves numerous technical reverberations in doing justice according to law. Justice ought to be done immediately after the surrender. Also, in speaking of a "consenting part," the Moscow Declaration recognizes that there is no honor in affording to distant butchers the "honors of war" simply because they happen to wear the uniform of a field marshal or admiral of the fleet or head of the Gestapo.

The Declaration solemnly promises that "most assuredly the three Allied powers will pursue [the guilty] to the uttermost ends of the earth and will deliver them to their accusers in order that justice may be done." It must be remembered, however, that there are neutral countries to which Hitler, Goering, Himmler, Tojo and the rest of the murderous Verein could escape by plane or submarine to enjoy, as "political offenders," a prosperous old age on the millions they have looted. In the true historic sense of the con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cept, they are not political offenders, but wartime murderers. Neutrals have already been warned; but some of the replies have not been too promising. It should be made clear to them and to the world that the attitude of neutrals with regard to the United Nations' project for vindicating law and justice on the international plane will be a significant index of where they stand on many other vital issues to come before the post-war world, including economic problems and the organization of peace.

2. Proof of guilt is now being assembled and prepared. As happened last time, there will doubtless be cries of "atrocity tales"; but proof in courts of law should convince the most skeptical that the reports of newspapermen and eye-witnesses and the documentary evidence seized in Axis headquarters are not mere vicious fairy tales.

3. As to the tribunals, the Moscow Declaration wisely provided for the trial of offenders at the scenes of their crimes and under the law of the victims' countries. However, it also recognized that this plan "is without prejudice to the case of German criminals whose offenses have no particular geographical localization and who will be punished by joint decision of the governments of the Allies." Domestic courts of the injured nationals are especially suitable for the trial of traitors—the Quislings, Lavals, Pétains, Doriots and their ilk; for members of the Gestapo who did their dark deeds in the victims' own homelands. But many crimes were committed inside Germany, and many others involved victims of several nations simultaneously. The Declaration of Moscow does not specify the nature of the "joint decision of the governments of the Allies"; but as a symbol of that "general international organization" the early establishment of which the four great powers recognized, it is desirable that the United Nations set up an International Criminal Court. This tribunal—necessary as a concrete token of the determination of civilized peoples to vindicate the rule of law in international affairs—might have jurisdiction of crimes committed by heads of states, prominent military and naval officials and civilian framers of major policies; of offenses committed against nationals of several countries in combination; of those committed against people rendered "stateless" by the Nazis; and cases in which an injured nation, for domestic reasons, prefers not to try in its local courts.

Despite certain claims to the contrary, sufficient law exists for the purpose. The international tribunal can apply existing international law which prohibits certain acts of illicit warfare and permits of their punishment.

4. "Chiefs of state," said by many lawyers, "on reason and precedent," to be immune from liability, can and should be tried and punished. It is the height of absurdity, as well as injustice, to punish underlings who carried out the illegal orders of a sovereign and his military and political clique, while permitting the planner of wholesale crime to go unscathed. Elements in the management of the destinies of Charles I, Mary Queen of Scots, Louis XVI, Napoleon and Jefferson Davis can be woven together into a sufficient pattern of "precedent" to justify the trial and punishment of Hitler. In fact, the Allied public arraignment of "William II of Hohenzollern, formerly German Emperor," in Article 227 of the Treaty of Versailles, for a "supreme offense against international morality and the sanctity of treaties," is in itself a powerful precedent. It did not result in the trial and punishment of the "All Highest" only because the Netherlands refused to surrender the Kaiser on an extradition demand, and not because there was anything "illegal" in the trial and punishment of the Kaiser. The Germans solemnly insisted that, "legally," Kaiser Wilhelm could not be tried and punished. One is reminded of their ancestors after Waterloo who had heatedly insisted that Napoleon be instantly shot without any trial at all.

In truth the trial and punishment of Hitler and the other responsible Axis-Fascist leaders is not so much a legal as it is a "political" question—a matter of expediency, policy and the will of the victor. The United Nations have a perfect right to do as they please with Hitler and the other misguided chiefs of state. They can shoot them without any legal proceedings; they can, in the treaty of peace, arraign them for a "supreme offense against international morality and the sanctity of treaties," as Wilhelm II was arraigned, and later subject them to trial; they can declare them guilty of any violation of the laws and customs of war which it is commonly known they have committed, without giving them a trial. However, solemn arraignment followed by trial in an international court is to be preferred; because in civilized justice even the criminal caught *in flagrante delicto* with a smoking revolver in his hand should be given a trial to determine the nature and extent of his guilt; because, further, in order to inform public opinion both in Allied and Axis-Fascist countries as to just what crimes the accused have committed, and to fix the record of history, it is necessary to prove beyond reasonable doubt the details of the offenses charged.

5. The defense of "superior orders" will present some difficulty. Article 347 of the American "Rules of Land Warfare," listing offenses in violation of international law, declares, "individuals of the armed forces will not be punished for these offenses in case they are committed under the orders or sanction of their government or commanders." A similar provision exists in the English rules. French military law evidently recognizes no such defense; but in French trials during the last war, the fact of obedience to a superior's order was sometimes made the basis of executive clemency. Construed literally, the Anglo-American provision, which did not get into the Rules until 1914, would mean that many Axis-Fascist violators of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

laws and customs of war would have a legitimate defense. True, Article 347 goes on to say that "the commanders ordering the commission of such acts, or under whose authority they are committed by their troops, may be punished by the belligerent into whose hands they may fall." But it could be argued that under this only commanders with absolute discretion could be held. So far as trials by American military commissions are concerned, either Congress or the President can remedy the situation raised by Article 347.

Some basis exists in Anglo-American and Continental decisions and practices for a tribunal applying not only international conventions and "customs as evidence of a general practice accepted as law," but also the principles of criminal law generally accepted among civilized nations, to limit the defense of "superior orders" to cases where the soldier obeys a lawful order or one about the illegality of which he has reasonable doubt. Where, patently, the order is violative of the laws and customs of war as embodied in the rules of land warfare, or of elementary concepts of criminal law, it is illegal; and the offender should not be excused even though his domestic law or the "will of the Führer" had declared such acts to be lawful. It would be a mockery of elementary justice for a German or a Japanese soldier to claim as a defense that he did not know it was illegal to use children as a shield against the enemy; or to torture and slay surrendered prisoners of war; or to exterminate whole peoples merely because of racial or religious prejudices; or to slay hostages wholesale on the flimsiest pretexts; or to kidnap women into white slavery; or to impress innocent civilians into slave labor in order to aid the Axis countries in making war against the victims' countries; or wantonly to destroy libraries and museums; or to steal and loot the property of unoffending civilians.

6. The punishments to be applied by domestic military and civil tribunals depend on local law and practice. Those to be imposed by the international tribunal might be the ones provided for crimes of similar nature by the law of the accusing country. The jails, penal and correctional establishments and reformatory agencies, including probation and parole (especially since much convict labor will be required to rebuild Europe), as well as hospitals for the criminal insane usually employed by the prosecuting country, should be resorted to by the international court.

Implementation of the above-sketched plan entails a great deal of careful labor. The United Nations have recently set up an official commission to draft the necessary details. It is to be hoped that the commission will not only assemble evidence, but determine upon sound policies of prosecution, procedure and punishment, select needed personnel and set the stage to be ready—when Germany, Japan and their satellites surrender unconditionally—to restore Justice to her throne above the alarums and excursions of Mars.

SHELDON GLUECK

Fascism in the Argentine

ARGENTINA, Latin America's "Little Italy," has a strutting dictator in the person of General Pedro P. Ramirez. She also has the most blatant features of fascism, such as smashed trade unions, censorship of the press and communications, arbitrary intervention in local government, repression of civil liberties, anti-Semitism, concentration camps and inflated international aspirations. Even a peculiarly Argentinian ideology of fascism is being adopted in the form of the "Rosistas" revival. It finds the roots of contemporary Argentinian totalitarianism in the strong-arm tactics of the notorious Juan Manuel de Rosas, whose regime of terror in the first half of the nineteenth century made him the prototype of the Latin American dictator. The Ramirez dictatorship is not just another manifestation of the traditional "caudillismo." Its measures go beyond anything previously experienced in Latin American politics, with the possible exception of the Vargas regime in Brazil.

Unfortunately, the American daily press has overemphasized the strength of the opposition to the new regime. In doing so it has obscured certain aspects which should not be overlooked in an appraisal of the unfolding Argentinian fascism. There have been repeated student manifestations against the policies of Ramirez. There have been protest strikes by aroused labor unions. There has been some courageous criticism of the government in the great dailies, La Prensa and La Nacion. But it would be sheer blindness to expect an early overthrow of the dictatorship. The situation in Argentina today is very similar to that in Italy during the early years of fascism. The recent strikes and protests are more symptomatic of the pangs which usually accompany the birth of fascism than of sounding its death knell.

While large sectors of the Argentinian people undoubtedly have strong democratic aspirations, the democratic tradition in Argentina is weak. While constitutional forms were observed, effective democracy was sabotaged by fraudulent elections, the spoils system and so-called "federal intervention." Both major parties, the Radicals, now in opposition, and the rightist National Democrats, made use of these devices. It is one of the ironies of the present political situation that the *anti-personalistas* in the Radical Party who originally opposed the paternalistic politics of the Radical

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President Irigoyen, now make up the "concordancia" government coalition with the National Democrats.

Although not the core of the problem of Argentinian fascism, Argentina's orientation in international affairs is relevant to its understanding. Popular dissatisfacton probably served as a convenient lever in bringing about the overthrow of Castillo. But already in the last few months of his administration a policy of cautious detachment from the Axis was noticeable. There was considerable apprehension, especially in the ranks of the officers corps, over the increasing military strength of Argentina's neighbors, Brazil and Chile, both benefiting from American Lend-Lease assistance. If the army revolt of June 4 did not lead to an immediate break with the Axis, this was because of Argentina's resentment at having to play second fiddle to the United States in inter-American affairs. Secretary Hull's rejection of Argentina's request for American machinery and armaments has intensified the friction between the two countries. For once the State Department did not appease a dictator. Mr. Hull's note to Admiral Storni meant a serious loss of prestige for the Ramirez government. It undoubtedly emboldened the opposition. But it also postponed an early break with the Axis, which would now signify Argentinian surrender to the United States.

What, then, is the *raison d'être* of Argentinian fascism? The answer can be found in the backing which the Ramirez dictatorship has received from the large landholding *estancieros* who have always been the real rulers of the country. They represent the Argentinian counterpart to the industrial capitalist class of Italy and Germany. Like the latter, they welcomed fascism as a last resort to maintain their oligarchic power. They are interested in preserving their enormous estates which make possible the acquisition by their owners of fabulous fortunes, partly through their stranglehold on cheap labor, and even more through their ability to manipulate high markets for exorbitant returns. But in recent years they have been greatly disturbed by the radicalism of the masses which has increasingly threatened their position. Hence they have allied themselves with the military clique whose fiery and provincial Argentinism appears to guarantee the maintenance of the status quo. Argentina's military caste, always a privileged group, has taken the place occupied in Italy by the Fascist Party and in Germany by the Nazis. And it has learned from both.

While the unexpected military movement of June 4 was a true *cuartelazo* (army coup) in the best Latin American tradition, the measures adopted by the new regime closely followed its European prototypes. Through a series of demogogic measures, compulsory lowering of unquestionably inflated prices and rents, the nationalization of some transport companies, a vast program of popular housing, the promise of an early improvement of the social-insurance system, the arrest of a number of politicians on charges of corruption and favoritism, the abolition of conspicuously superfluous government positions and a series of similar moves, the Ramirez government sought to win popular favor. As a matter of fact, it succeeded, for a while at least, in fooling the people. The common people favorably received the lowering of rents, and ceiling prices. Middle-class people welcomed the revolution as a possible end to the preceding era of frauds and lies. Capitalists looked upon the drastic actions of the new regime as emergency measures to "clean up" the political situation. But the honeymoon did not last.

That Ramirez was determined from the very first to hold on to the power he had illegally acquired, appears from his instructions to the press not to refer to the new cabinet as a "provisional" government. The opposition was silenced by the immediate dissolution of the Congress. Elections for the presidential electors were suspended. Thus Ramirez made himself President for an indefinite period. To strengthen his hold on the whole government machinery, generals, colonels and lieutenants were appointed to administrative positions, even minor posts and police commissions. All of these appointees were conspicuous nationalists and friends of Germany, Italy or Spain.

Even more significant were the instantaneous appointments of federal interventors in the provinces, larger cities and universities. These interventors are the Argentine analogues of the German *Gleichschalter*, or "coördinators." They are particularly trusted officers. For example, the *Intendente* (administrator) for Buenos Aires, General Basilio Pertiné, is a well known Nazi sympathizer, a member of the board of directors of the blacklisted Siemens-Schucker Company and a personal friend of the former German Ambassador to Argentina, von Thermann. The federal interventor of Tucuman province, Dr. Alberto Baldrich, the only civilian to hold this official position, is a fanatical nationalist and a fervent opponent of what he once called the "pachydermic North American bureaucracy." Dr. José Maria Rosa Jr., appointed president of the Council of Education of Santa Fé province, is a constant contributor to the violently pro-Axis, anti-Semitic newspaper Pampero and Argentina's foremost exponent of the theory of economic nationalism.

Foreign and domestic pressure has only led to further strengthening of the fascist personnel in government. Mr. Hull's rebuke to the Ramirez dictatorship was answered with the appointment of General Alberto Gilbert, an outspoken opponent of the United States, as Foreign Minister. The appointment of Adrian Escobar, a convinced Falangist, as Ambassador to the United States, and of Dr. Enrique Ruíz Guiñazú, Castillo's pro-Axis Foreign Minister, as Ambassador to Spain, underlines the fascist character of the regime. Domestic protests, exemplified by the recent declaration of 150 anti-Axis Argentinians, demanding "effec-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive democracy and the fulfilment of international obligations," are acknowledged by new purges of government personnel participating in such manifestations of dissatisfaction, and the appointment of more rabid fascists. For instance, the new Minister of Justice and Public Education, Dr. Gustavo Martinez Zuviria, is a militant Catholic and leader of ultra-nationalist intellectuals. In the fall of 1942 he organzed the *hispanidad* congress in Salta which was attended by Dr. Ricardo Caballero, the chief of the reactionary "Rosista" movement. There is abundant evidence that whatever freedom of speech is officially allowed is intended to trap those who make use of it in order to enable the government to discover and eliminate its adversaries.

Censorship of the press is strictly enforced. On August 23, 1943, the government instructed the provincial interventors on press policy. It was announced that the newspapers should not be subjected to previous censorship or instructions. In reality these instructions are disregarded. Newspapers have been told not to accept articles by opposition leaders. They may not carry articles considered injurious to the "constituted authorities." Upon Mussolini's fall the papers were especially instructed to make no comments which might prejudice Argentinian neutrality or give comfort to any belligerent, meaning, of course, the United Nations. Finally, the papers were recently instructed to abstain from carrying any information not obtained through official sources.

But what about the opposition? As everywhere where fascism succeeded, it is hopelessly split. The Socialists, who as far back as late 1942 suggested the establishment of a "Democratic Union" with the Radical Party and the Progressive Democrats of Santa Fé province, are as passive as were their comrades in Italy and Germany at the time of the advent of fascism in those countries. At first they believed in a government promise that elections would be held. One of the Socialist leaders, Dr. Alfredo A. Palacios, until recently president of the University of La Plata, advocated leaving the government alone so that it would make mistakes and exhaust itself. This was exactly the line of the Social Democrats in Germany in the early months of the Hitler regime. The Radical Party is rapidly disintegrating. Many Radicals were at first sympathetic to the new regime because the previous Castillo administration had kept them out of power through electoral frauds. Some Radical Party members, for instance Colonel Pomar and General Ramón Molina, were even instrumental in bringing the army clique to power, though none of them has been given any responsible post. The Communist Party put up some opposition. It continues to publish a clandestine newspaper, Unidad Nacional. But the party is numerically small and most of its leaders have been thrown into concentration camps at Neuquen and Villa Devoto. Other pro-democratic organizations, especially the strong Accion Argentina, have been dissolved and their leaders have been imprisoned.

The trade-union movement, from which some opposition might have been expected, is sorely split. For some time there has been a bitter struggle within Argentina's largest trade-union federation, the Confederacion General del Trabajo, for control of the organization. The struggle culminated in the split of last March between the forces of José Domenech, the incumbent Secretary General, and the followers of Francisco Perez Leiros, the candidate of a coalition of Communists, some Socialists, and independents dissatisfied with Domenech's control of the CGT. Both groups set up separate headquarters. The Perez Leiros group, now dissolved, charges Domenech with selling out to the Ramirez dictatorship. Indeed, Domenech seems to have received assurances from the government that his anti-Communist stand will make his union immune from government interference. In view of this situation, no effective opposition to the Ramirez government can be expected from organized labor. The two other national federations, the Union Sindical Argentina and the Comite Obrero de Relaciones Sindicales, both anarcho-syndicalist in tendency, are politically impotent.

No political miracle should be expected in Argentina in spite of reports of protest strikes and student demonstrations. The opposition is too scattered. Large sectors of the population have not as yet understood the real significance of the new regime. The government consists of a highly homogeneous group of colleagues and friends who, having seized power, are unlikely to relinquish it for some time. There may be changes in personnel, partly as a result of disagreement on foreign policy, partly as a concession to such opposition pressure as might make itself felt. But even if an advocate of a pro-United Nations foreign policy such as General Rawson, who is now in practical exile as Ambassador to Brazil, should take over, there is no guarantee that he would not continue the dictatorial regime.

Argentinian liberals and democrats find themselves in a paradoxical position. They actually hope that Ramirez will not break with the Axis now because in that event he would feel empowered to do almost anything he pleased in internal affairs. He would be sure that he would not receive any warnings or pressure from outside, such as the recent Hull note to Admiral Storni. Unfortunately, the recent agreement between Argentina and Great Britain by which the latter will buy all Argentina's exportable surplus of meat and eggs for some time to come, has immeasurably strengthened the Ramirez regime. But if the Argentinian fascists, for expediency's sake and as a result of Anglo-American pressure, should break with the Axis, it does not mean —and this needs double emphasis—that they are no longer fascists in the eyes of the people of Argentina.

HEINZ H. F. EULAU

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American Prisons Go to War

BLOOD PLASMA for our soldiers, sailors and marines, enough money eked out of miserably microscopic earnings for bonds to buy three giant bombers, war production of weapons, supplies and food on a large scale, now come from convicts in state prisons, reformatories and prison farms.

Without exaggeration, three things can be said of this: first, it is one of the most substantial accomplishments in the history of America. Second, it offers one of the greatest opportunities for the *future* of America. But third, if these prison gains are not solidified and sustained, it may lead, with the outbreak of peace, to one of the most tragic failures of our civilization.

This is the story of how prisoners of our society, deprived of their liberty by conviction of crime, are making patient and heroic efforts for the liberty of mankind from within prison walls. And they are doing this in a society that is either largely hostile to them or oblivious to their existence.

This article is mainly concerned with state prisons and is based on my experience over the last year and a half in the Prison Industries Branch of the War Production Board. The enormous advance for our state prisons has received the support of all groups—labor, political, business and agricultural. But it must be borne in mind that this opportunity came only because of the war. Also, it came despite hundreds of restrictive state laws and several federal laws which—for the time being—have been *suspended* only. If they go back into effect, the prisons will be deeper dungeons of stupid brutality than ever before.

After Pearl Harbor, gigantic quantities of goods, weapons and food were needed and there could be no limit to the goals of production. Since practically every state prison was low in industrial production and all of them capable of some diversified production, with no objection by labor or capital, and the military market in need of everything, the state prisons got the contracts and went to work. These prisons met the specifications and sold at decent, reasonable prices.

In the last war, nothing was done by the state prisons (except one tiny shoe-repair contract by New Jersey). Now every state prison in the Union produces war materials. For a period of approximately a year, the figure has reached $14,000,000. This production is all the more remarkable because it has been achieved by prisoners working longer hours—some up to 72 hours per week, with night shifts, and all voluntarily, with new production-line methods difficult to establish. In all this, there has been but one definite incentive—patriotism. This $14,000,000 production is *war work*, and is *in addition* to the $21,000,000 of goods for state use annually produced in prisons.

Some of the articles produced industrially are: navy shirts (3,200,000); British boiler suits; blankets (complete process from shearing sheep to weaving and dyeing); osnaburg for camouflage; all types of bunks and furniture; assault boats; tool boxes and chests; trunk bodies; submarine fuse boxes; submarine nets; bomb noses; bomb racks and many other military supplies.

The prison farms of America produced goods to a value of $23,908,000 in 1942, an increase of about $5,500,000 over the previous year; meat production rose from 9,000,000 pounds to 18,000,000. Over 5,000,000 gallons of fruit and vegetables were produced. The year 1943 will show great gains over 1942.

My belief is that agricultural and meat products can be brought up to $100,000,000 production per annum with some relatively inexpensive increase in acreage, plus scientific management. All this can be used without harm to labor or capital, and with benefit to all taxpayers. More, it will bring sufficient and varied diet to inmates, with consequently better morale and health.

Now let's look at the military record. Ninety percent of all prisoners have relatives in the service. As a result, from the beginning they clamored to get into uniform themselves. The traditional attitude of many against the induction into the armed services of a man with a court or prison record was overcome by the Secretary of War's request for an amendment to the Selective Service Act.

A procedure was set up by the War Department and the Selective Service System to screen out types of prisoners unfit for service, such as the sex pervert, the drug addict, the chronic alcoholic and the habitual offender. Special Selective Service Boards have been set up in all prisons, federal and state, and now, worthwhile, acceptable inmates are going into military service, although not enough of them. I predict that those accepted will make as good soldiers as their brothers on the outside: so far, the records bear me out.

The prisoners also actually clamor to give their blood for our combat troops, and insist on giving as much as the Red Cross will take. I know of one state prison of 2,000 inmates, located in a county with a population of 400,000, where the prisoners have given more blood than the nearly half-million free, well fed Americans on the outside. And they did so voluntarily.

The Prison Industries Branch of the War Production Board consulted the state wardens about prisoners helping in bond drives—but we were worried because men only get from five to fifteen cents per day, and in many prisons, absolutely nothing. We figured that the maximum of bonds that prisoners could buy out of their mosquito-like earnings, would be $250,000, or enough for one big bomber.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The amount jumped to $400,000 in the first week. Within three weeks, it reached $800,000; at the end of the drive it totaled $968,000—enough for three extra big bombers. Federal prisoners were rightfully angry at not being included in the "Buy a Bomber" drive; had they been, with their much greater earning capacity, the amount might have been tripled.

Numerous prisoners have volunteered to act as "guinea pigs" in the cause of science. Many have been made seriously ill. One has actually died acting in this sacrifice for science—for which, being pronounced well dead, he received a pardon couched in the most extravagant terms of praise. Other prisoners have covered manpower shortages of various kinds by working on railroads, farms and forests; thousands have done so on their honor, without being under lock-up or guard; there have been no escapes or attempts to escape.

All of these prison gains represent great assets for society. In the past quarter-century most prisons were an outright financial drain on the people and constantly turned out prisoners whom they had curdled into permanent criminals, further to plague society. Now prisons are on the road to self-support, which adds up to self-respect and means that prisoners will be released better men than when they went in. *These gains must not be lost when the war ends.*

Morally, a prisoner, like any other human being, is entitled to work. Indeed, he is sentenced to "hard labor." He is also entitled to good food, a clean bed, recreation and medical attention. Since he must work, it should be productive and educative labor, and not of the humiliating type which breeds only hate, and then vomits him out penniless and friendless onto the concrete sidewalk of society to renew his criminal career. While in prison he should have the opportunity of regaining or maintaining his health, which, in a great majority of cases, is defective at the time of admission.

Of course, prison labor should not be "contracted out" as in the old days, to the detriment of free labor; there should be no "dumping" of products; and labor should generally be guaranteed against all of the old abuses of the past. But certainly no segment of our society should object to products being used for state needs; for sale and trade to other states, the government and Lend-Lease or relief.

It must always be remembered that around 98 percent of all prisoners return to society.

And now it's time that we think in terms of a concrete program to preserve the gains made during war, and to go forward in the future. I offer ten points for a post-war plan for prisons:

1. *All of us must realize that prisons and prison life have a direct effect on the whole of society, morally, physically, economically, socially, politically and financially.*

2. *Get the "politicians" in on this.* Nothing can be accomplished unless the public officials and lawmakers are included. The smug-mugs might as well realize this.

3. *Establish the merit system* for employees, and not necessarily a hide-bound civil service to freeze-in stupid incompetents or persons not suited to prison-work careers. This will require informed public opinion.

4. *Train prison officers.* This must be done just as in the FBI, the army and the navy and as in all intelligent systems of public service. Obviously, training schools must be established.

5. *Try to keep people out of prison.* This is better than bellowing prosecutors' and hard-boiled judges' ignoring humanity and trying to "make records" on the letter of the law. It will necessitate a *pre-trial examination* to see if a defendant might be adjusted to society by probation. All this requires an informed community to back up thoughtful judges and prosecuting attorneys, well trained psychiatrists and common-sense social workers.

6. *Study criminal-trial procedures.* See that codes don't jam a man into jail without sound reason for conviction. "Habitual criminal" laws based on technicalities and the mere number of convictions, such as the so-called Baumes laws, are flat failures. There are, of course, habitual criminals, perverts and others, who must be restrained permanently.

7. *Keep up prison agricultural and industrial production and the chance to work.* This, in order to make institutions pay-as-you-go and save the taxpayers' money. It is helpful in the rehabilitation of inmates. There should be diversified farming and industrial production, for state use first, with any surplus to be disposed of with adequate guarantees that it will not jeopardize the rights or position of free labor.

8. *Pay wages to prisoners, however small.* (Several states do *not* pay; the average payment is from 5 to 15 cents a day; federal prisons pay from 50 cents to $1.50, also overtime and double time.) Wages should be paid so that the prisons will be part of our American system, and to keep up morale of the inmates. Families have been, and may be, kept together this way. Have the inmate save for the day he gets out, and as in Minnesota and a very few other states, have money allotted, as it is in the army, to his dependents.

9. *Have different kinds of confinement; abolish stripes and the rule of "silence" altogether.* Out of a thousand men, including murderers and robbers, only about a hundred need to be closely confined. There should be honor farms, cottages, prisons without walls, and various other types of confinement which have proved effective during the past quarter-century.

10. *Help the men after they get out.* At the very best, those who are discharged will be booted around enough. They will need help in meeting inevitable and cruel discouragements on the outside.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All of these points apply to all types of prison—federal, state and local. I have not emphasized the federal system because it needs much less help.

The political situation that exists in regard to the state prisons is particularly unfortunate. Unlike the federal system, many of the state systems are *in* politics, but have no strong political backing, as does the federal system. The state systems also get a larger proportion of criminals of the toughest type and have fewer facilities for their confinement. State systems are broken up not only into the 48 states, but into the 130 personalities of the various wardens. Salaries are low, and at present there are no training programs for supervisory personnel except in New Jersey.

States also have the further drawback of the restrictive laws. I keep emphasizing this because unless they are amended or repealed nothing can be accomplished. Therefore repeal agitation must begin now.

The remedy for state politics and restrictive laws is not merely to throw up our hands and speak somberly (and slightingly) of "the politicians," thus piously washing our hands of responsibility. Rather, we should get all public officials in on the plan. The truth is that a better prison system, nonpartisan in administration, is good politics.

As to our several thousand jails and lock-ups—grammar schools of crime—they are worse than any state prison or chain gang. As a local official for six years, I saw how brutalizing and degrading they were. An overwhelming majority of American jails are simply terrible; and to use inelegant, but quite correct words, jail reform lies like a dead buzzard over America. Go see for yourself—but see it all.

Fortunately, many states are coming to life on the prison problem. Governor Arnall of Georgia is really starting something fine; he has abolished stripes and chain gangs; he is giving every encouragement to developing a better system. Over the country, state wardens, governors, legislators, social workers and people generally are giving the matter some attention.

And we must prepare: When the global cauldron of death and war cracks, 25,000,000 war workers and 10,000,000 war veterans will spill out on America, as hundreds of millions will over the world. In America there will be, as all know, a period of confusion and readjustment, with resentments, restlessness and uncertainty. There will be criss-cross migrations, and the social problem of crime will be enormous. After all wars, jails and prisons refill and become overcrowded. The time to prevent such a tragedy is now.

Chambers of Commerce, labor unions, professors, everyone, now have post-war plans. All this is encouraging. But included in all these plans must be provision for an intelligent treatment of delinquency, whether adult or juvenile.

The gains prisons made during the war *up*grade rather than *de*grade this country. We must prepare now, and make up our minds now, both liberal and conservatives, that after the war we will not *fall back* into the maudlin hatreds and mawkish meanness of the "Crime Wave" and Baumes Era of the twenties and thirties.

MAURY MAVERICK

Britain and Post-War Aviation

THE FIRST Empire Air Conference, presided over by Lord Beaverbrook, opened recently in London. It follows fast upon President Roosevelt's important statement on freedom of the air at his press conference of October 1. It is the culmination of a year-long debate on aviation's future.

The future of aviation is of personal concern to the people of Britain. They remember the long nights of the winter of 1940: lying in their shelters and cellars, they cursed the airplane—the latest and most spectacular of man's scientific triumphs. At such times it was a commonplace to hear the Cockney say, "That's the Wright brothers gone wrong, that was."

Out of the air raids, prompted afresh by the flocks of fighters and bombers which fly daily over the roofs of so many English towns and villages, encouraged by the nationwide desire for a peace that would be more prosperous and more secure, emerged a hot debate on post-war aviation. Meetings were held, committees formed—and speeches from the other side of the Atlantic were given prominence.

The utterances of Clare Luce, for example, met with a response as bad as the reception of Henry Wallace's speeches was good; they were thought by some to foreshadow an attempt to make American air power midwife to the American Century. It only gave our own nationalists the handle they wanted when she said in Congress: "On the very day the shooting stops, the British naturally desire to be in a position to put muscles and flesh on their international airways system. And perhaps even fat in some places—with Lend-Lease planes. . . . There is not a shadow of doubt that this country . . . could keep the air supremacy it now has, and take henceforth in the skies that position of enlightened democratic leadership Great Britain holds and still holds on the sea."

It was not surprising that Lord Rothermere should have countered in the House of Lords a few months later: "The moment has come, in my opinion, when men and money can be found to safeguard our future in aviation. This country was built up by what is known as the command of the seas. It was built up by the fact

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that our ships sailed throughout the length and breadth of the oceans of the world. I say that the same must happen in the skies."

Back and forth the discussion continues—across the floor of Parliament, across the committee tables, across the narrowing waters of the North Atlantic. The powerful Society of British Aircraft Constructors and other "expert" bodies pointed with alarm to the ascendency of the United States in the production of transport planes. British airliners had for many years been outclassed by American; the small British aircraft industry had concentrated in peace on military types such as the famed Spitfires which saved the country from defeat in the fateful summer and autumn of 1940. In wartime, Britain was building no transport planes, except the Avro York, transport version of the Lancaster, while the United States was rolling out hundreds every month. The consequence, naturally deplored by the aircraft manufacturers, was that Britain would have to rely for some years after the war on American planes for its civil air services.

The only compensation lay in British possession of a world network of air bases. Before the war Imperial Airways, using imperial bases, had been theoretically able to span the world; only the trans-Pacific route was barred because landing rights in Hawaii were unavailable. The existence of the far-flung empire, potentially or actually rich in landing grounds, seemed to be Britain's strongest card.

It was thus hardly surprising that the Joint Air Transport Committee, representing the Federation of British Industries, the Associated Chambers of Commerce and the London Chamber of Commerce, showed itself specially sensitive about freedom of the air: the committee realized that the free air would undermine British bargaining strength. When 15 United States air lines suggested that American planes should continue to have landing rights on the many new airports which had been scattered over the surface of the world during the war, the committee hit out sharply. "That issue [freedom of transit]," they said, "is likely to be obscured by the introduction by the 15 air lines of the contentious question of the future availability to the United States flag carriers of air fields which, through geographical fortuity, the United States have considered it wise to construct, during war, on Allied territory. It is to be hoped that the American air lines will give further consideration to this particular point." The committee will like still less the pronouncements of the Five Senators.

But Britain's advantage could only be fully realized if the dominions acted in concert. The first essential was a conference with the dominions; the Commonwealth must speak with one voice. And there were those who saw in aviation an instrument for uniting the Commonwealth as never before. Only a few weeks ago Mr. Curtin, the newly elected Australian Labor Prime Minister, advocated a new and closer structure for the government of the Commonwealth.

Behind the maneuvers and the negotiations there is a growing public awareness of the importance of aviation. The thirty-eight-year-old airplane had barely begun to affect the lives of ordinary men and women when war broke out. Wartime technical progress has now made it certain that the plane will touch their lives ever more closely. It will become cheaper and safer and be more extensively used. Distances will become shorter with every fresh advance. Frontiers whose function it has been to separate countries will become anachronisms. Ever larger political units will become viable.

In this perspective, more liberal views are beginning to be heard. Narrow-minded nationalism must not, it is beginning to be said, permeate these vital discussions. Aviation men who, like oil men and unlike scientists and artists, have never been remarkable for their international outlook, must be disciplined in the public interest if they are not to irritate international relations beyond endurance. Aviation, which was ruthlessly used in the past as an instrument of power politics, must be used in the future as an instrument for making the world one community. Progressives, on both sides of the Atlantic, must have a policy; on no account must they be misled by their own imperialists.

Others are suggesting that transatlantic wranglings must not be allowed to provide the mold in which the future of international aviation is set. If Russia is neglected it will be at the peril of Britain and the United States, for Russia's geographical position and industrial status will give her a stake in international aviation in many ways greater than that of either country. The smaller countries must not be forgotten.

Subsidies must be eliminated and full freedom of the air established. There must be a new, worldwide International Commission for Air Navigation which will continue and extend the work which this commission did before the war. For political, commercial and technical reasons, there should be a World Airways which would operate the main international routes, as well as all services in certain regions; even certain Conservatives now favor one common international service for the continent of Europe.

It is only a whisper as yet: the people with an international outlook are only just beginning to gather their thoughts and their strength. But this first whisper may in the long run prove far more significant than the views of Clare Luce, Juan Trippe, Lord Rothermere of the Society of British Aircraft Constructors, more significant than the resolutions of the Empire Air Conference. The vested interests will be swept away if the common people of the United States and Britain insist that there must be full coöperation among the United Nations in the air.

London MICHAEL YOUNG

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Congress and Inflation

THE FIGHT over the general economic situation is now building up to some sort of climax in Congress. There are half a dozen different engagements all stemming out of the one big battle. This week comes the fight on subsidies, with the prospect that the administration will take a licking. Next week comes the House debate on the inadequate Ways and Means Committee tax bill. Generally the House rubberstamps a tax bill submitted by its committee, because the membership is too big to write a bill from the floor. If the administration is to have any success in restoring anti-inflationary taxes, it must be achieved in the Senate, and the prospect is not very bright. Meanwhile the President has made pledges to labor to hold down living costs which he is unable to fulfill, primarily because Congress will not go along. As labor grows restive, its complaints give anti-labor sentiment in Congress and the press an opportunity to launch new attacks.

The individual frustration of administration plans is instructive, but the deeper interest is in the structural weaknesses revealed in the congressional system itself. The Constitution gives the President responsibility, but it does not give him power—the basic distinction from the parliamentary system. The current anti-inflation effort is the biggest problem in economic planning that any American administration has ever seriously undertaken. If we can't work this, how can we manage centralized planning, controlling disastrous ups and downs and creating full employment after the war? It begins to look as though the machinery for organized economic planning is inadequate.

Mr. Roosevelt, in accordance with his responsibilities, has brought in a fairly well coördinated program consisting of higher taxes, price controls, subsidies, food rationing and the like. They are the procedures that have worked successfully in other countries. Furthermore, the public is agreed on the objective. Theoretically, at any rate, everybody opposes inflation. But Mr. Roosevelt has no way of getting Congress to adopt his program. It is important to note that if he were a conservative Republican President he would have just about as much trouble with farm-bloc pressure groups and the like as he does now. Under the parliamentary system, an unsuccessful cabinet could, of course, resign and the opposition would take over the burden, promoting the sense of responsibility all around.

Up to now America has been able to get along fairly comfortably under the inevitable compromise procedure this system produces. But you can't compromise with inflation. Thus these current economic battles, in the latter part of World War II, are something of a test. Looking down on these floor fights from the press gallery I have a gathering sense of something portentous. Is our 150-year-old system flexible enough to cope with this new type of economic problem, I wonder, whose basic requirement is delicate coördination at a dozen points; or will a change have to be made in the machinery? With the tools at hand, Mr. Roosevelt has managed to keep the cost of living down to about half of what it reached at this point in World War I, but if Congress has its way in the next few months it looks as though the dam would go out.

Two things can be said about the Senate fight on the poll tax: betting odds probably should be against the reform going through, but on the other hand, it has a better chance now than ever before in history. The question boils down to whether democracy can be made to work sufficiently in the Senate to get a vote on the issue, or whether this elementary right will be denied by archaic procedure permitting a successful filibuster. The House has passed the bill overwhelmingly. It has been reported out, two to one, by the Senate Judiciary Committee. An undoubted majority in the Senate favors repeal. Will there be a vote?

It takes a two-thirds majority in the Senate to apply cloture. This is the most lax procedure in any important legislative assembly in the world. It is another example of a minority of "one-third plus one" being able to block the Senate majority will, as in the similar two-thirds requirement to ratify a treaty. Poll-tax opponents have a stronger position this year than last, however. Argumentatively, they can point to the failure to repeal the tax in Tennessee, where state voters ratified the reform but the constitution stood in the way. Politically, they can point to the approaching election. Last year Republicans watched with amusement while the Democrats fought among themselves, and took little part in the battle. This year, with the Negro vote at stake, it may be different. The Negro vote, I am told, played an important part in the Louisville, Kentucky, election. Technically, at any rate, Senator Van Nuys (D) of Indiana, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, will be carrying the ball for reform. Nobody believes he cares very much about reform, and he will probably knife the bill in a minute if he sees political advantage in so doing. But Van Nuys is up for reëlection next year, too. An effort will be made to confuse matters by bringing in a proposed constitutional amendment, which is another way of defeating the bill. All the parliamentary cards are stacked against reform. But it has one great argument in its favor: We are fighting a war for democracy, and to refuse even to let the issue come to a vote would be a cynical outrage to the boys at the front.

Cissie Patterson's Washington Times-Herald met the charge by Harold Ickes that it was part of a coördinated editorial McCormick-Patterson axis in characteristic manner. On the page in which it denied the Ickes' charge was a cartoon—copyrighted by The Chicago Tribune. And the very editorial which announced Cissie's independence carried a copyright line at the bottom. Copyrighted by whom? The New York Daily News. . . . With all the talk of meat shortages, latest Department of Agriculture statistics will show that the average civilian is actually getting more meat now than before the war! The five year pre-war average was 126.4 pounds, whereas it is now 128.6 pounds. The "shortage" comes largely from lower income groups entering the market, who previously couldn't afford meat. Despite undoubted discomforts, Mordecai Ezekiel, the department's top economist, tells me that "there is probably less malnutrition in the United States today than ever before."

Washington T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Newsreel

THE NEWSREEL FILM is a superficial, inconsequent mirror of world affairs which inevitably comes in a poor third to the radio and the newspapers in its news coverage. Two weeks ago the newsreel program offered in movie houses contained the de Marigny trial, the bombing of the Naples post office by delayed-action mines the Nazis had left there, the Moscow Conference, Notre Dame's football victory over Navy, a war-plant fire in New Jersey and an article titled "Swim for Victory" (which had no swimming or even water in it, but showed the new bathing suits to be worn presumably during the winter months). Football fans saw a few scattered touchdown plays, the Moscow Conference consisted in a brief snapshot of Cordell Hull getting out of a plane at some airport, almost a third of the newsreel of what is supposed to be actuality in the making was posed, and the storm, the fire and the football game followed such old, conventional newsreel patterns that they could have been a thousand other storms, fires or football games that the newsreel has covered, and no one would have noticed.

The attitudes in newsreel making parallel those that go into making story films, because they are produced at the same impossible rate of speed and in the same exorbitant quantities (the newsreel produces two complete changes of program weekly), in the same kind of vacuum, inside of which there are half a dozen different newsreel companies but not one whose product is appreciably different from the others, or tries to be, and they command the same complete popularity. The newsreel, like the story film, is more conscious of its audience than of its reason for being, and will vary and modulate each of its programs until it has an item in each for every taste—polar bears, the Apple Queen, the President's speech and the latest-style mink jacket. It is just as afraid of a subject that is controversial as the fiction film is, just as afraid of the instinctive, individual and characterful, and of showing a subject that is short of being the height of pleasure (the terrible nature of the Naples bombing, in which you can see the injured trying to escape the explosion and fire, and a man covered with blood lying stunned against a lamppost, is ended with a shot of some town where the Italians rejoice at the arrival of American troops). The newsreel is so rushed for time it loses all sense of timing in its individual shots and, like Hollywood, invariably falls back, as a result, on certain well worn patterns of newsreel presentation.

Since it involves so much more complicated a process than the other newsgathering agencies which have only to set type or put mouth to microphone, it becomes ever more questionable whether the newsreel should attempt keeping abreast of all the news, and not instead concentrate on presenting a more comprehensive digest of fewer events. During the last decade, and especially since the war, the documentary, which also treats of actualities but examines the idea or event in all of its references, has made the newsreel look more and more functionless and its content less valuable. This was never more apparent than in the four-reel film, "Desert Victory," which gave audiences a greater knowledge of the event it covered than anything that has been written or broadcast about it, let alone all that has been sprinkled haphazardly about the event through a hundred newsreels.

Whatever its future direction and task, there are definite ways of improving the newsfilm in its present form, and the most apparent way is to limit its coverage by at least cutting out those events that are of no importance as far as one's knowledge of anything is concerned—for instance, the way in which Mr. Hull descends from an airplane. A shortening of the field covered would release more cameramen to each event, and would necessarily counteract the spottiness of present-day coverage. What is most needed is more curiosity and imagination on the part of the cameramen, or perhaps it may be the editors. Consider how little we know of the actual visual character of personages that we have been seeing over and over in newsreels, like Hull or Roosevelt or de Gaulle, and you will realize how uninterested and sterile the newsreel camera is. There is nothing candid about this camera. The personality that is interviewed by Fox Movietone, Paramount or RKO-Pathé is invariably prepared with his most presentable or least spontaneous manner.

The only truly unposed and disarming and significant portraits we get in our newsreels are either of military enemies, like Mussolini, or of little people who have no social prestige who are allowed to go to pieces or get along as best they can in front of the camera, and as a result appear natural and human. The medium's laziness is also shown in its inability to stay with a good thing in an action, but to be moving forever away from it, and unable to alter the speed of the moving so as to make the material more easily grasped. At present it employs few of the newsreel's resources, especially slow or fast motion, still photography, microscopic lens, divided screen and montage. What seems most characteristic of the modern newsreel is this lack of imagination or even interest in what it is doing; people run for touchdowns, soldiers walk through cheering throngs, storms lash countless seaboards, and the newsreel streaks past with the attention of an eight-day bicycle rider, showing neither less nor more interest for any part of what it sees, though the announcer is always enthusiastic and happy, and only different when he is more so.

MANNY FARBER

A Communication

The Quetico-Superior Forest

SIR: Like the lakes of Finland, the northern border of Minnesota combines beauty and tradition. Its cool waterways extend far across the international boundary, linking the United States and Canada in a maze of more than 15,000 connected lakes. Along this route beyond Lake Superior passed the early exploration and fur trade of the Northwest, first up the Pigeon River for 40 miles and then across a narrow divide into the vast Rainy Lake watershed that drains westward to Lake Winnipeg and thence to Hudson Bay. No wonder that the Webster-Ashburton treaty, more than a century ago, guaranteed the border waters and their well worn portages to the free use of the peoples of both countries, for this historic lakeland is blessed with what Thoreau calls "the tonic of the wilderness."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As a measure of protection for the fast-vanishing timber and game, President Theodore Roosevelt in the spring of 1909 proclaimed Superior National Forest among the scattered federal lands on the Minnesota side of this region. Ontario responded by setting aside a solid block called Quetico Provincial Park. Each tract was about a million acres.

It became more and more evident, however, that these outposts of conservation, covering only about one-fifth of the area, were inadequate. The delicate balance of nature was far too interdependent to survive partial protection and partial exploitation. Waste or defilement rapidly engulfed both. Timber slashing was followed by fires. Fires spread from the logged to the unlogged country. Dams were part of the logging, both for transportation and power. Dams not only swamped beaches, islands, rapids, waterfalls and wooded shores on the lakes directly affected, but upset the water levels on all the lakes below. Plant and animal life and even the fish suffered from these violent changes.

If anything of public value was to survive, some public plan for the area as a whole became indispensable. It was proposed therefore to extend the existing forest preserves on each side of the boundary to include the balance of the border lakeland, exclusive of lands better suited for agriculture or industry. So far as possible, a single continuous forest would be established, reaching along the boundary from Rainy Lake east to Lake Superior and encompassing the border waters and their tributaries in both countries.

Without giving up sovereignty, both countries would agree *by treaty* to apply certain simple principles of conservation. Lakes and streams, with all their natural features, would be held inviolate for the health and enjoyment of the public. Timber, game, fish and fur-bearers would be handled for maximum natural production and for regulated use on a yield basis. Natural resources, including the intangible esthetic values, would be guarded against waste, unsightliness and depletion; and the heart of the area would be kept, so far as practicable, a wilderness sanctuary.

This so-called Quetico-Superior program was first approved by Secretary of Agriculture Jardine in 1927. In 1930, Congress, after a spectacular fight, passed the Shipstead-Nolan bill, forbidding further dams and laying down a recreational policy in the Minnesota portion of the area. In 1934 President Roosevelt created a special five-man Quetico-Superior Committee, serving without compensation and charged with the duty of facilitating the project.

From the start, however, the project has been opposed by powerful Minnesota timber companies, all of them interested in water power as well as timber. State officials, too, have repeatedly acted to obstruct the program. About ten years ago the Minnesota Department of Conservation blocked purchase by the United States Forest Service of vital private lands and thus held up for at least ten years the completion of Superior National Forest, which is the indispensable agency of public control on the Minnesota side.

Recently state officials have resumed their opposition in much bolder form under the plea of "states' rights." Governor Stassen first refused consent to a large federal purchase of private lands in the Kabetogama Purchase Unit of Superior National Forest, where the Forest Service has been operating with full state authority since 1936. His newly appointed Commissioner of Conservation refers to the purchase program for this purpose as a "mess of pottage" and appoints as his deputy the former commissioner, who was dismissed at the time of his previous obstruction of the Quetico-Superior program.

Moreover, these officials sponsored and passed in the 1933 session of the legislature two measures, which place in their hands the power to block completion of Superior National Forest, if not to disrupt what has already been accomplished. The first measure reëstablishes, at opposite ends of Superior National Forest, where federal ownership is not yet complete, two conflicting state forests. The second requires the consent of a three-man Land Commission, headed by the Governor, for federal purchases in any part of the Forest except within the "original" boundaries.

The choice in the border area of Minnesota is really not between federal forests and state but between federal forests and none. The private lands, which are the crux of the problem, are left wide open to waste. The state has no funds either to acquire or to develop them. The result is to block the one logical and effective agency that can handle them and to play directly into the hands of selfish interests. As D. W. S. Cooper of the University of Minnesota Botany Department put it in a letter to Governor Stassen: "If, as I understand, you favor the two bills here discussed, I cannot avoid the unwelcome feeling that you are holding an isolationist attitude as far as the state is concerned and are in opposition to the broad policy of administering the resources of the nation for the benefit of the nation as a whole."

It seems unfortunate that state officials should have chosen to reverse state policies while the young men of the state and nation are away at war. It hardly seems the time to foreclose, or even impair in the slightest, their recreational future by clamping fetters upon Superior National Forest. Surely the Quetico-Superior program, either as conservation or as a peace venture with a friendly neighbor, calls not for obstruction but for hearty collaboration.

Minneapolis, Minn. ERNEST C. OBERHOLTZER

The Bandwagon

Dr. Gant Gaither, chairman of a special committee of the Christian County Medical Society, said today that "members of the society will close their offices and cease to practise if Congress takes up consideration of the proposed act to socialize medicine." – *An AP dispatch from Hopkinsville, Kentucky.*

The National Legion of Decency lists Samuel Goldwyn's "The North Star" as "Class B—Objectionable in Part" in its rating of pictures for the week of November 11. The Catholic organization in its report on the picture, dealing with a Russian village under Nazi invasion, takes exception to the "killing without judicial process" of a Nazi doctor by the Soviet guerrilla defenders. – *From The New York Times.*

Freedom of the Press

KING VISITS NAPLES
FINDS PUBLIC COOL

– *Headline in The New York Times.*

ITALY'S KING RECEIVES OVATION ON TOUR
OF STREETS IN NAPLES

– *Headline in The New York Herald Tribune.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Total-War Department

The Senate Military Affairs Committee discovered today that the army is accepting able-bodied illiterates as long as they can count a few blocks or tell the difference between a square and a circle. . . . An acceptable illiterate, Captain Thompson disclosed, is a man who can add 5 and 3, 8 and 8, or tell in what direction an arrow is pointing. – *AP dispatch from Washington.*

Russia on U. S. Time?

If you ask Secretary of State Cordell Hull the time of day, he says nothing. He stretches his lanky frame to reach a long thin finger into his vest pocket, pulls out a watch, and silently shows you the face.

This knack of producing the evidence and letting others draw the conclusion may be Hull's most valuable diplomatic trait—particularly in Moscow. – *An editorial in The New York Mirror.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; $1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – THE EDITORS

Correspondence

Spain: Multum in Parvo

SIR: Thank you for your editorial paragraph, "Spellman on Spain," in the issue of October 25. I have believed since 1936 that a man's attitude toward the Spanish civil war is a pretty sure index to his political philosophy as a whole. When one has made allowances for the large struthocamelian group who never woke up to what was going on there, who considered it only another Iberian feud—"Oh, *cosas de españoles*, you know, they're so excitable"—the fact remains that the Archbishop's point of view is largely the official one, in our country and in Britain. It is by no means peculiar to, or principally inspired by, the Catholic Church. It is shared by the Best People. In 1938, for instance, Ellery Sedgwick, at that time editor of The Atlantic Monthly, published a schoolgirl-crush article on the murderous alcoholic, Gonzalo Queipo de Llano, Captain-General of Seville. He described him as a knight, a great Christian paladin, a super-Tennysonian hero; and while Queipo in his own country seems to have gone the way of all slime, it is not recorded that Mr. Sedgwick's crush has undergone a corresponding change. That was a freak, no doubt; but this cult of Franco is no freak.

It isn't pleasant to suggest that a Prince of the Church may be a liar, but the Collier's articles are more than "distortions and inaccuracies," as you call them. They are evil. They are more dangerous than the anti-Semitic, anti-Negro tendencies of the subversive press precisely because they are respectable. As long as we cannot point to responsible leaders of Church or of state as essentially different from what we profess to detest in Germany or Japan, I don't see how we can say that we have learned a thing from Munich or the subsequent horrors. Spain was the testing ground of ideas, and Spain still is.

Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass. DUDLEY FITTS

About Otis Ferguson

SIR: It is with a strange and unexplainable regret that I have read this afternoon, in Malcolm Cowley's piece in your November 1 issue, of the death of Otis Ferguson. I never knew Otis Ferguson personally, but in the sudden realization that his writing will never appear in your journal, a sense of unique personal loss came over me. While he was writing for you I used to wait expectantly and eagerly for each issue of The New Republic to arrive; I know of no other writer in any other periodical or magazine whose pieces gave me that feeling. When my subscription ran out, now and then, and I missed an issue, I headed for the nearest library the first chance I had, to catch up on him. No matter how portentous the other news of the day, I never read anything else in your magazine until after I had read what Otis Ferguson had to say on movies, books or the jazzmen.

In my college days, before the war, my roommate and I used to discuss what it was about his writing that intrigued us so much; we never came to any valid conclusions, but many times during those years we found ourselves imitating his style as best we could—consciously or unconsciously—in our own writings: term papers, pieces for the college publications, short stories and what not. And I am certain that in this respect, too, I'm not entirely alone among the some-day writers of my generation. (Witness your own Manny Farber, I might slyly add.)

I didn't always agree with him in his opinions of the movies he reviewed—and from Malcolm Cowley's piece I now understand why this was a little better; nevertheless, I always used to go back after I'd seen a movie and reread Ferguson's review of it. (The one single disagreement I had with him that I recall most vividly was over Philip Barry's "Holiday," still being brought back, I see. Otis thought it stunk, and I thought it was terrific. The same goes for John Ford's "The Long Voyage Home," but in this he must have known a great deal more than I about it, and the manner of his death is eloquent testimony to this.)

What it was exactly that made his writing vivid and exciting to me, I cannot yet determine. His style was unique, to be sure, and any number of times I remember feeling the necessity to reread a sentence—sometimes a whole piece—to understand what he was trying to say. Yes, a professor of English Composition in the usual tradition, would, I am afraid, find his writing structurally chaotic and his wording sometimes horribly confusing and excessive—but when you have said this, you are still left with the fact that he was one of the most honest and careful craftsmen of his time. He got across to the reader an emotional intensity and fire that is conspicuously lacking in most other writers who deal with such material. He made it seem terribly important that people understand the art forms he was writing about—motion pictures, books and jazz—and I, for one, have felt that necessity ever since. Perhaps it was close to poetry—indeed I am sure that in the case of his pieces on jazz and the men who play it, his writing *was* poetry more often than it was prose. It had a peculiar haunting quality for me, and the nostalgia that was inherent in it was never sentimentalized. It was simply decent, honest sentiment about men doing the work they loved, and I'm sure Otis loved hearing them do it as much as anyone. In the area of accurate description he was again on bedrock—his comments on the quality of Bing Crosby's singing comes as close as anyone has ever gotten to describing the voice that millions of ordinary Americans know by heart. And I'm sure that, if he were able, he could do a beautiful job on the current favorite of the bobby-sock set; I feel certain this favorite would be among Otis's "phonies."

The last thing he wrote, with the exception of the convoy poem that appeared in The New Yorker recently, was, I think

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a piece on the song-writers who are capitalizing on the phony patriotism of the war: the Sammy Kaye-Remember Pearl Harbors. And somebody wrote in asking him just what in hell he was doing if it wasn't capitalizing on the same thing in a different way—making money without sacrifice. As I recall, Otis didn't answer that letter. You had to do it for him, because Otis had gone out and joined the merchant marine. I felt good about him, despite the knowledge that he wouldn't be writing anything for a while. But I always had the feeling that when he came back after the war, he would start writing stuff that would place him among the few really great writers of our time.

And now he won't be writing anything more at all. But if any of you up there in The New Republic editorial rooms know what you are about, and I think you do, you will see to it that his writing *is* collected into a book some time soon, and thereby give a good many people the chance to catch up on the Ferguson pieces they have missed and to reread, when they can, the many others that they wouldn't have missed for the world.

At the risk of saying a very trite thing, I should like to say that I am sure that Otis Ferguson, the seaman, died the way he would have wanted to.

Richmond, Va. 2nd LT. JUNIUS EDDY

[It is a pleasure to be able to tell Lieutenant Eddy and other readers who have written us that Alistair Cooke, of the British Broadcasting Corporation, has undertaken to make a collection of Otis's pieces.—THE EDITORS]

Use the Social Security Fund!

SIR: There was considerable pre-war concern over the economic effects of permitting the Social Security fund to accumulate $45,000,000,000 or $50,000,000,000, which appears as altogether likely by 1980 or earlier, when receipts and expenditures are expected to balance. Why would it not be both feasible and wise to use receipts, above that required annually for social-security expenses, to pay off part of the national indebtedness? It would be utilizing a sterile fund (unburdened with interest) to pay off an interest-bearing government obligation, and would save the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

While we're about it we had better use this money to retire bonds held by Federal Reserve and commercial banks, since interest paid to them is the least probable to find its way back into circulation. Furthermore, they have the least moral right to receive interest, for while private lenders make definite sacrifices to buy bonds, the banks merely create bank deposits with which to buy bonds by the use of pen and ink.

REO M. CHRISTENSON, WOJG, USA

Fort Rosecrans, Calif.

The Armed Services Editions

SIR: In Malcolm Cowley's article of October 11, it seemed to me he was a little unfair to the Armed Services Editions which are published by the Council on Books in Wartime, Inc. He spoke of them being printed on "flimsy newsprint." Actually, the paper selected for the Armed Services Editions is two grades higher than newsprint and more expensive; it is also more durable. He also suggested that the books would probably fall to pieces after two or three readings, and that this was one of the aims of the Council. Neither of these suggestions is strictly accurate. The army estimates at least six readings per book, and our own guess is that each book will have a good many more readings if it is not particularly roughly handled. These editions are by all odds the strongest of any paper book in comparable size on the market. Unlike the bindings of other paper publications, these are stapled, and even in those volumes which have the usual "perfect" binding, we have added a staple so that the pages won't pull out easily. The usual "perfect" binding is apt to become unglued in very damp tropical weather. This won't happen to any of the titles in the Armed Services Editions.

Members of the Council are not worried that the books may offer competition to the regular market, because most of them will be used abroad. These books are "expendable" only because they are so inexpensive—the result of mass production plus the fact that the Armed Services Editions have no sales or advertising costs.

ARCHIBALD G. OGDEN, Executive Director,

New York City Council on Books in Wartime, Inc.

"The Walsh Girls"

SIR: Like Mr. Breit, whose review of "The Walsh Girls" appears on page 723 of this issue, I too had read Mrs. Janeway's novel before the reviews came out, but, unlike him, I didn't have to "nervously reread" what I had read, for I knew exactly what I thought of the book: that it was an adult and exciting study of the relationship between two sisters. I too had criticisms: that severe cutting would have improved it and that the setting and characters, though labeled New England, were much more like Larchmont, New York. Mr. Breit says, apropos of John Chamberlain's calling the book anti-fascist, "It is a broad nomenclature that can refer eqully to 'The Walsh Girls' and a book by Ignazio Silone." I quote part of a paragraph:

> . . . Apparently she [Lydia, a high-school teacher] had endowed her lusty Polish boys and girls with the spirit of evil, and her reward was the infringement of this evil on her own personal life. Now she was reacting in blindness and hate. She doesn't know what she wants, thought Helen painfully. She just wants negation; she wants it not to happen; she wants to think it all out of existence. Suddenly Helen was angry. It was in the darkness beneath these negations that the disease of the age lurked. No cruelty is too bad to be exercised on that which you will not admit exists. Emotional blindness like Lydia's was what had brought slavery and bestiality back to the world.

I wouldn't be surprised if these few lines stuck in the minds of anti-fascists longer than more portentous and more official pronouncements.

New York City ELIZABETH HULING

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Robert Ferrari of Cambridge, Massachusetts, sends us an open letter to President Roosevelt in which he asks that the Allied invasion of Italy should be stopped immediately. Mr. Ferrari believes that Germany can defend herself in northern Italy indefinitely, and that continued land fighting in the peninsula can have no useful effect for the Allies and can only result in the destruction of Italy herself, now our friend, and the priceless treasures of her cities. He urges that instead of continued ground fighting, the Allies should rely entirely on bombardment from the air.

Virginia Foote, of Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa, has sent us a copy of a letter addressed to President Roosevelt, calling to his attention the injustices suffered by Pvt. Alton Levy, and urging the President to use his official power "as a weapon against the myth of race supremacy. . . ." The letter bore about 100 signatures of students and faculty at Grinnell.

Ward McCabe, of Washington, D. C., sends a letter of correction. In Potomacus' article, "Chandler of Kentucky" [October 11], the statement appeared that Chandler starred at football in his college days. Mr. McCabe tells us that the Senator's specialty was baseball. Furthermore, "he didn't even know Keen Johnson until ten years after he had started his political career. . . ."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

Port of Refuge

SOME DAY a great novel will be written about the lives of the refugees in Marseilles, Lisbon and Casablanca. They gathered in these cities from every conquered or Nazified country of Europe. They belonged to every political sect—as Arthur Koestler once wrote—from A for Austrian Monarchist to Z for Zionist Jew; there were even rebellious Nazis among them. They quarreled violently with one another, Trotskyists against Stalinists against Social Democrats against Monarchists—not to mention the older quarrels of French against German, of Czech against Austrian, of Hungarian against Yugoslav that continued among these outcasts from every nation. The one distinction that all of them shared like the Legion of Honor granted to a whole regiment was Hitler's persistent hatred. In the Nazi press, they were always mentioned with contempt, but it was a contempt that hid something like fear. "These are insignificant people," the Nazis seemed to be saying, "nothing but journalists, school teachers and left-wing politicians. The whole pack of them isn't worth a single platoon of SS troops, yet somehow they are able to raise whole nations against us. If we get rid of the intellectuals, our troubles will be over."

It was not enough for the Gestapo to drive them into exile; they were also hunted down in their cities of refuge. Every month there were new stories of exiles kidnaped and murdered—like Willi Münzenberg, to mention one name. The others lived at the mercy of native officials, who might at any moment surrender them to Hitler or put them across the border. They lived between visits to the American consulate, where most of them were treated like criminals seeking a reprieve. They lived on sufferance, on charity, on the few odd jobs that were open to foreigners; the wives of famous writers were baby watchers. In the parks you could see doctors of philosophy walking other people's dogs and wondering whether it wouldn't be possible to kill and eat them.

When the exiles met on the Cannebière, they told gruesome or funny stories. A friend of mine received two letters by the same mail, both of them signed by the Prefect of the Department of Var. The first letter ordered him to leave the department within twenty-four hours under pain of arrest. The second categorically refused his request for permission to leave the department. Another friend was married in the sight of God and had been trying for eight years to get married in the sight of the French Republic. Every time he assembled the necessary papers and was ready to have the ceremony performed, the authorities issued a new regulation making it still more difficult for exiles in France to legalize their unions. In 1941 he had a stroke of luck: the Prefecture in Marseilles announced that foreigners intending to leave the country within thirty days could be married by special dispensation. After the wedding he received a telegram signed by half a dozen of his friends. It was a quotation from the Passover services: "What is it that makes this night different from every other night?" He and his wife went back to their hotel. At five in the morning, two detectives knocked at their door and carried him off to prison. Still another friend, a German liberal, was refused an American visa but granted one for Mexico. When his ship docked at New York, he was permitted to go ashore for the night. At breakfast he read a newspaper story that changed his life: the President had forbidden all German aliens to leave the country.

It seems to me that a hundred such episodes, tragic or ironic, could be worked into the texture of a novel whose theme would be the fate of a whole generation in European letters. There is not much doubt that Arthur Koestler would be the best man to write the book. Not only did he share the life of the exiles in Marseilles and Lisbon (and in the concentration camp at Le Vernet) but he also has a quality in his writing that few living novelists possess: a sense of the moral issues behind political events. A dialogue between two systems of thought, each with its soldiers and its martyrs, each presented with its dreams and human failings. You feel of him that he is one of the last independent observers.

Yet "Arrival and Departure,"[1] although it deals with the exiles, is not the novel he might have written after "Scum of the Earth" and "Darkness at Noon." The trouble seems to be that Koestler is exclusively preoccupied with a moral problem facing most of the refugees. He omits almost everything else, including the real situation in which the moral decision has to be made.

The decision is whether Peter Slavek, a revolutionist from Central Europe, is to lead his own life or to sacrifice himself for a cause about which he has many doubts. He faces the decision in a port of refuge that seems to be Lisbon, although its name is never mentioned. Peter arrives there as a stowaway, after escaping death in an Axis prison. Now, in the atmosphere of a neutral country, he is like a deep-sea fish hauled to the surface; his mind disintegrates from the lack of external pressure. Dr. Sonia Bolgar, a psychoanalyst who happens to be a friend of his family, undertakes to nurse him back to health. Probing into his memories, she discovers that his devotion to the working class is due to a thirst for atonement, which in turn is due to a sense of guilt acquired during early childhood. Her analysis convinces Peter, who feels that Sonia has set him free; now he can go to America and live at peace with himself. But he changes his mind after two long conversations, one with a Nazi agent and the other with a crippled British aviator. He will return to his own country in spite of his doubts, and there sacrifice his life to defeat Hitler.

Some of the scenes are brilliant or deeply moving—for example, Peter's memory of the "mixed transport" for political prisoners, army prostitutes and "useless Jews," which is a superb story in itself. What you miss in the book as a whole are the details that might explain or lend weight to Peter's decision. Everything except his inner life seems

[1] Arrival and Departure, by Arthur Koestler. New York: The Macmillan Company. 180 pages. $2.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fantastically simple for a refugee. He reaches his port of refuge as a stowaway without a passport, and yet he is never once questioned by the Portuguese police. He runs out of money, and yet this problem is magically settled when the doctor offers him a loan. "Sonia had put him into touch with one of the relief committees for political exiles, and they had promised him a sum which would enable him to repay her"—it was all as easy as that. An American visa was immediately forthcoming for this man with an international reputation as a Communist leader, and there was even a steamship ticket: "Sonia had prepared everything during this last week of his convalescence."

With all the real difficulties overlooked or pushed into the background, "Arrival and Departure" misses the color of life among the refugees. What is more important, it gives a curious picture of Peter Slavek himself. He becomes a purely passive figure, a man who is fed, clothed, lodged, healed and provided with papers while making no efforts of his own. Even his dreams are of falling, of undergoing torture, of meeting death; they are never dreams of outwitting his enemies. As a result, you simply cannot believe what Koestler says—that his name "was to become a legend for a whole generation in his country." You cannot believe that any decision taken by such a helpless and introverted character would be of importance to the world outside himself. He might become a martyr, but these are days when martyrdom is easy. There is nothing in the book to show that he could ever become a hero. MALCOLM COWLEY

Herbert Matthews' Italy

The Fruits of Fascism, by Herbert L. Matthews. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 341 pages. $3.

MR. MATTHEWS was an enthusiastic admirer of Mussolini and the Fascist regime at the time of the Ethiopian war, and his admiration was still alive at the end of 1937 when Mussolini's intervention in Spain was yielding the results everyone remembers. We are told in 1943 that the Spanish civil war taught Mr. Matthews "what fascism really meant, and how it could be fought and had to be fought." The present book is the outcome of that conversion. Talleyrand used to say that fools alone never change their minds.

There is, however, a flaw in this story. Mr. Matthews does not tell us that, although already a foe of fascism when he went from Spain to Italy in 1939 as correspondent of The New York Times, he acted in Rome in 1939-40 not as an independent (not to say anti-Fascist) observer, but as a literary editor of the "pap" with which the Ministry of so-called "Popular Culture" supplied him and his peers.

This does not mean that the book resulting from his rather belated conversion is useless or bad. The more the truth is stated, the better. In perusing this piece of "now-it-can-be-told" literature, the American public will learn that a large part of what they had read about Italy in The New York Times for twenty years had been just the opposite of the truth.

Mr. Matthews spent most of his time in Rome in the artificial and unhealthy atmosphere of Fascist newspapermen, politicians and public servants. Therefore he holds that the Italians are addicted to "cleverness, cynicism, amorality, brilliancy, pyrotechnics"; that, "like freedom of the press, speech and religion, Parliament meant little to the average Italian"; that "the real indictment against Italy is based on the cynicism and complacency with which the people accepted the criminal policies of their leaders, including the stab in the back of France—and we must never forget"; that "the Italians wanted to cash in on the German triumphs; the jackals wanted their share of the feast"; etc., etc. Yet Mr. Matthews loves such "Italians" and hopes that his children "will always love Italy and the Italians." If all the Italians were like those whom Mr. Matthews loves, I would not hesitate to hold that they should be exterminated to the last man, woman and child.

Let me state, however, that not all the Italians are like that. Mr. Matthews himself, after recalling that a Fascist newspaperman wrote that "we Italians" ought to be and will know how to be more brutal than the Nazis, adds: "He should not have said 'we Italians,' but 'we Fascists,' for Italians are not brutal and never can be." Mr. Matthews should have kept more constantly in mind this difference between the "Fascists" with whom he used to consort and whom he loved in Rome, and the "Italians."

Giolitti, who almost without interruption ruled Italy from 1907 to 1914, had all the faults except brilliancy and pyrotechnics. And as for cleverness, cynicism and amorality, I surmise that not a few Anglo-Saxon politicians would not feel humble if compared with him. A Latin sins and confesses. An Anglo-Saxon sins, forgets and blames everyone else for the sins he has forgotten.

Had Mr. Matthews been better informed about Italian political life before fascism, he would have known that, if it is true that Parliament meant little to the average Italian (what does Congress mean to the average American?), the Italians were very particular about the freedom of speech and of the press, and freedom of religion was respected in Italy no less than in any other country. Italian liberal journalists, who had been put out of commission when Mr. Matthews was working in Rome, withstood the Fascist onslaught from 1921 to 1926 with courage, dignity and heroism. I do not know whether in any other country newspapermen would behave in the same way as did those Italian newspapermen under seven years of violence and perfidy. The Italians supported the liberal papers in their resistance as best they could. When their premises and printing presses were burned, money instantly came from all quarters to allow them to start again.

If in June, 1940, Mr. Matthews had lived not in the Roman-Fascist sewer, but in Milan or Turin, he would have noticed what was obvious to anyone who was there: that the days of the stab-in-the-back against France were days of national mourning. Everybody in the street cars, cafés, trains, was silent. The Italians, generally expansive and talkative, could find no other means of showing their dismay and disgust than gloomy silence.

I do not say that all of the Italians are different from those whom Mr. Matthews loves. Italy has produced Saint Francis of Assisi and D'Annunzio, Dante and the Fascist newspapermen, Toscanini and Mussolini. And between those extremes of saintliness and debauchery, greatness and baseness, refinement and vulgarity, there is the ordinary man who in Italy, as in all countries, as Mr. Mat-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thews put it in a moment of lucidity, "is not a hero, an ascetic, an idealist; he is just a simple individual who wants to eat and live in peace, to have his home and his little plot of land, to marry and give his children a little more of the good things of life than he enjoyed."

GAETANO SALVEMINI

Fiction Against Fascism

This Festive Season, by Jeanne Singer. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 237 pages. $2.50.
The Trespassers, by Laura Z. Hobson. New York: Simon and Schuster. 410 pages. $2.75.
The Walsh Girls, by Elizabeth Janeway. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc. 314 pages. $2.50.
See What I Mean, by Lewis Browne. New York: Random House. 245 pages. $2.50.

THREE OF THESE FOUR NOVELS ARE ANTI-FASCIST; the fourth has been called one. Two of them are first books and two of them are resolved by a form of *deus ex machina*. Of the four, perhaps only one is successful, and that on a strictly limited canvas.

"This Festive Season" is a first book with a brave little knowledge about the Jewish question. Robert Silver is an expectant teacher whose expectancies get chucked down the drain because he is a Jew. Richard Sturtevant, Gentile, friend to Silver, member of the board which liquidated the Jew, is horrified by his colleagues and his own brand of quietism. He sits down and writes that Americans can catalogue the dangers but don't believe in them with the "blood belief that stimulates the sweatglands and the tear-ducts. . . . " The refugee girl, listening to her two friends, has a whale of a cry because she hadn't realized that anti-Semitism is here too. Her tears drive Sturtevant to action, Silver to love, the reader to temper.

Laura Hobson's "The Trespassers" is the most nearly baffling. Perhaps because the book is split clear down the middle. There is a love story written in an anonymously high-geared, smart advertising prose. There is a hate story in a turgid prose-poetry that does little to enhance Miss Hobson's reputation as a writer.

Vera Marriner is having a devil of a time being in love with Jasper Crown, budding radio genius and full-blown egomaniac. Along with this nervous affair, Vera is doing what she can to get a Vienna psychoanalyst and family passage to America. Our Visa Division in Zurich is doing what it can to prevent passage because, as far as I could make out, it was fighting something of a holding action. At a certain stage in the book there is a crystallization: Jasper lets Vera down—to a point where she has a nervous breakdown (the most genuine bit of the book). Then in the nick of time, visas in Zurich get okayed, the analyst's wife dies. The good doctor, one can't help feeling, is going to make a long highball for the heartsick heroine.

The book's value is its statistics on immigration laws and refugee quotas. In the light (or darkness) of the stories of the heroic Warsaw Jews, this side of the book is something of a shocker.

Having read part of Elizabeth Janeway's first novel, "The Walsh Girls," when the notices began to appear, I nervously reread those pages and continued on to the

"Writing of the craft of fiction, she has written a notable essay on the craft of life."

—HAMILTON BASSO

Ellen Glasgow

"We have had no other novelist who either would or could have written thus about his own work, a set of prefaces with such distinction, point, tact, wit and searching emotion. In these days, so vast and confused, when most books are at best only good material half-completed as literary medium, it is a notable experience to find a book so profoundly unified, so brilliantly quiet and proud and distinguished." —STARK YOUNG

"What other novelist have we now with as clear a historical position . . . with so much intelligence, poetry and wit, and with so many proofs of a kind of integrity that is rare at any time?"

—VAN WYCK BROOKS

$3.50

A Certain Measure

HARCOURT, BRACE AND COMPANY
383 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

end with an extra-exacting scrupulousness. But I was unable to change my earliest opinions.

The story (the not unfamiliar one of a girl who goes away from her home town, breathes the air of a different world, then returns to marriage and adjustments) is made out of protracted, monotonous, feverishly repetitious inner monologues. Everybody thinks to himself, nobody does anything. Everybody is feeling (within a severely constricted scale) but Mrs. Janeway has no dramatic equivalents for these feelings ("objective correlatives," T. S. Eliot called them). Oddly enough, but not for the whole book, these monologues have a certain morbid fascination through their insistence and tenacity, as if they might overwhelm you, if not with quality, then with quantity. But it is hard to be overwhelmed for long when the scaffolding is flimsy, the characters' notions too contrived. For hardly any reason, Helen thinks her old-maid sister is insane when everyone knows old maids live on a plane of "natural" peculiarity. Lydia returns her sister's compliment: Helen is insane. The husband doesn't think anyone is crazy but he doesn't think much anyway. It all comes out all right when Helen has her baby.

I don't think any of this would be fatal if there was some clean, sharp, fresh writing somewhere in this long book. The prose is altogether too urgent, disproportionate, sticky (which can be mistaken for poetic style): "He must make her see. He must bring this unnamed thing that lay between them out into the open. He loved her so! He would do anything, anything, for her. Only she must be his!"

John Chamberlain says the book is anti-fascist. It is a broad nomenclature that can refer equally to "The Walsh Girls" and a book by Ignazio Silone. That Helen Walsh's first marriage was to a German liberal murdered by the Nazis is irrelevant and incidental. In the thirties she might have married a Communist, in the twenties, a bohemian. The Walsh Girls would hardly have raised an eyebrow.

Lewis Browne's "See What I Mean," narrow, clever and back-ended as it is, is by far the best of the foursome and an engaging book. Back-ended because the fascist business gets twistingly out of focus, becomes a sort of hapless shenanigans. If the book is read as a clever twist of the hard-boiled detective thriller, it can be entertaining.

Crooks, cranks and croonks (the combination) take a witty lambasting through Clem Smullet's disingenuous defense of his dubious activities. Publicity-man Smullet took a job publicizing the "Crusade," a crackpot, fascist organization. His restricted but cagey brain operated something like this: What's the difference? I'm doing a job and I'm doing it pretty well. Does a chemist ask whether his formula will kill a house rat or a housewife? The FBI thought there was a difference. From a prison cell, Smullet tells the story of the rise and fall of the Crusade with disarming candor and equally disarming guile in a speech that is a spicy, truly keyed mixture of literacy and slang: "And I want you to believe every word in this book, because I don't intend, as the lawyers say, to mitigate, prevaricate, or equivocate in any manner, shape or form whatsoever. In other words, and I state this on my oath and positively sincerely, I am going to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help me God—and the Federal Court."

I don't believe Lewis Browne intended to hold Smullet up as an example of the evils of specialization. But the only way in which God or a federal court might have helped Smullet was to give him some philosophy. For the little grifter was a specialist and, like many specialists, he lacked a guiding principle.

HARVEY BREIT

Exiles on Exiles

The Torch of Freedom: Twenty Exiles of History. Edited by Emil Ludwig and Henry B. Kranz. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. 426 pages. $3.50.

THE MEN about whom this book was written were the great torchbearers of history. The men and women who wrote it are among the famed ones who, in our day, keep alive the torch of freedom when the black wind of tyranny threatens to blow it out." This is what the publishers say about this volume which opens with a portrait of Ovid by Lion Feuchtwanger.

Was Ovid a torchbearer? Feuchtwanger says he was a "lackey who had been suddenly chased away," very sad at not being in Rome having dinner with his friends. It was a good tradition, among libertarians, to loathe Ovid, and Mazzini certainly would have objected to being considered his colleague in any sense whatsoever. Tycho Brahe, the Danish astronomer, was disgraced by the powerful Christian Walkendorf, and died in exile, but Karin Michaelis fails to show clearly why this incident should assume for us a universal significance. And what about Dostoevsky, who, says Mr. Alfred Neumann, was a "fate-bearer" (not to be confused with a "torchbearer")? One has to be a very fiery Dostoevskian to forget that, for the creator of the Karamazovs, exile provided an endless occasion for extremely dull diatribes not only against everything European and modern, but against everything that was alive: science, social ideals, atheism, intellectual restlessness, new habits and ways of life. From this point of view the "Journal of an Author" is an unsurpassed monument to bigotry and the-will-not-to-understand.

Emil Ludwig has taken care of the portrait of Carl Schurz. I don't mean to contribute to the slogans of "Vansittartism," but certainly the so-called German Revolution of 1848 was a poor show staged by poor actors. Heroes like Carl Schurz who at the age of nineteen, at the peak of their libertarian raptures, could make to a friend the quivering confession: "We are all republicans, but with deliberation and moderation," were of different stuff from their French, Polish or Italian contemporaries. At twenty-three, this honest young man found exile "empty and enervating" and had only one desire: to settle down and start some "constructive" work. Which he did in America very successfully.

Long live Tadeusz Kosciuszko. He certainly was a libertarian, and exile for him was no career. Of Kosciuszko, the shy general, the friend of American Negroes and hero of Polish peasants, the sensitive warrior and revolutionist, Josef Wittlin has drawn a nice portrait. There is an absence of effort, of gestures, of stiff ideologies about Kosciuszko which he probably owed to his eighteenth-century education and which makes him a figure much more endearing and significant than, let's say, Mazzini, who appears now more than ever, completely bounded by his fanaticism.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One goes on reading "The Torch of Freedom" and finds a biography of Marx by one of the torchbearers of the French Popular Front, M. Pierre Cot, striving to show that historical materialism is not such a shocking theory after all. The reader cannot help feeling slightly depressed.

Evidently no Plutarchian conception presided over the planning of this volume. Nor do its editors and contributors seem to have gotten together on a definition of the word "freedom" and of the word "exile." Unfortunately, their uncertainty is not without significance. Of course, nobody would expect from Mr. Ludwig anything but the most unqualified eclecticism. What about Anthelme Brillat-Savarin, the charming author of "La Physiologie du Gout, ou Méditations de Gastronomie Transcendante"? He was an exile, too.

NICOLA CHIAROMONTE

The War Years

Home Front Memo, by Carl Sandburg. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 310 pages. $3.

THIS IS a collection of Carl Sandburg's writings during the present war years. Long an isolationist, he changed his mind after the fall of France. He was persuaded by the editors of The Chicago Daily Times that he had a public duty to place his views before the American people, and he embarked on a newspaper column for the Times syndicate. He has been writing war poetry, and his Lincoln scholarship has been largely devoted to rooting out aspects of the Civil War that throw light on this one. A few folk stories and a commentary for a photographic exhibit on the war round out his recent literary production, all of which is gathered up in this volume.

I regret to report that most of it is pretty inferior stuff. Sandburg's major fault, a slapdash and rambling style, is particularly conspicuous in a book made up mostly of newspaper columns. The column demands, in addition to personality—which Sandburg has in good measure—economy with both words and ideas. These columns are prolix, and only an occasional one ends with the subject of its beginning. His warmth, gentleness and sound feeling for American life are here, but they rarely break through the tedium and repetitiousness of his prose. He works a few enthusiasms—air power, Sweden, Archibald MacLeish and, of course, Lincoln—much too hard to hold the average reader's interest. His taste can be bad enough to include a maudlin tribute to George M. Cohan and a noble one to George W. Norris in the same column; his essay, "What Would Lincoln Do Now?" strikes me as a perfect justification for almost all of the less elevating deeds of the Roosevelt administration. As for Sandburg's recent poetry, I am afraid that it is only too well represented by this line from "Take a Letter to Dmitri Shostakovich":

> What you sometimes say, Dmitri Shostakovich, is the same as the message MacArthur sent by radio to Stalin: "Magnificent! Matchless!"

Toward the end of the book Sandburg includes a brief note explaining the circumstances under which he has been writing and admitting the many faults of his work. Like his friend Stephen Vincent Benét, he felt that he should let his "writing for the moment go forth for the moment." Possibly he was right to let his editors talk him into a column; but he was wrong in letting his publishers talk him into making a book of those columns and other odds and ends.

RICHARD H. ROVERE

Struggle and Song

Coal Dust on the Fiddle: Songs and Stories of the Bituminous Industry, by George Korson. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 460 pages. $3.50.

MR. KORSON'S BOOK is adequate as a full-length mirror held close to mining life. The mound of sociological description, historical narrative and folk-verse here presented should be a very welcome vantage point to all who are sympathetic to labor's struggle. As background to recent headlines, the book is timely, exciting.

The writing is seldom more than competent reporting. This is true equally of the literary form and of the author's response to the poetic and political thunder of the material. But Mr. Korson's warm and comprehensive sympathy for the miners is proudly obvious. His concern is not at all with problems of program; his "theoretical response" is limited to rather naïve indignation, a primitive class-consciousness, and it never matches the vitality and pathos of his information.

The bulk of the verse, presented without critical comment, is not very good. Since much of it was written to be sung to popular old tunes, the rhythms are conventional and unrelated, in any indigenous sense, to mining life. The

Now it's in book form!

The complete master script of a widely discussed film.

Lillian Hellman's

The NORTH STAR

A Motion Picture about some Russian People

The author of *Watch on The Rhine* has written a drama of a Russian town in the path of invading Germans. This script will be fascinating to all interested in motion picture technique, to Miss Hellman's thousands of admirers, and to everyone who would read one of the great narratives of this war. *Introduction by* LOUIS KRONENBERGER $2.00

The Viking Press
18 E. 48th St., New York 17, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expression is frequently sentimental or hifalutin, concerning itself with standard values and experiences in the standard way. One seldom finds here the originality of many Negro songs.

Heightened by full, fanatical unionism, retarded by a rural, degrading environment, lives lived in mining camps have exploded in struggle and song since 1880, when corporations gained control of the industry. From that date to this, mining history has been a tome of suffering and slaughter. Throughout the verse presented in "Coal Dust on the Fiddle" one can feel the miners trying to fight through stilted and conventional phrasing toward a real expression of their lives. But the fight for bread comes first; and, perhaps, as one of their poets has put it, "The extent of their great suffering there is no tongue can tell." The book is an impressive chronicle of the class struggle, with music of the miners' battle; the exposition of an amalgam composed of the American dream—and the American nightmare.

DAVID T. BAZELON

A Reader's List

FOOD AND FARMING IN POST-WAR EUROPE, by P. Lamartine Yates and D. Warriner (Oxford, $1.75). This is one of a series of highly useful pamphlets dressed up like books and ridiculously priced at $1.75 each. It is a downright shame so to restrict their circulation, for they are the stuff out of which intelligent opinion can be made. This particular item is a factual though lively portrayal of the politics and economics of the peasants of Europe. From it you can get the reliable external facts, a feeling of how it is with half the population of Europe, and a cautious yet expertly grounded program for rehabilitation after the war.

YANKEE LAWYER: The Autobiography of Ephraim Tutt, by Arthur Train (Scribner's, $3.50). There has rarely been such a confusion of identity between an author and his favorite hero. Arthur Train, who is a lawyer and a Yankee, has been writing stories for the last forty years about a Yankee lawyer named Ephraim Tutt. The fictional lawyer has now become an author too, and his autobiography turns out to resemble that of Arthur Train —they had somewhat different adventures, but they ended with the same tastes and opinions. Whether you call this the real life of a fictional man or the fictional life of a real man, it has the codfish flavor and the horsehair touch of New England at the turn of the century.

Contributors

SHELDON GLUECK is professor of Criminal Law and Criminology at the Harvard Law School and the author of numerous works in criminology. He is a member of the Advisory Committee on Rules of Criminal Procedure of the Supreme Court of the United States, and of the Commission for Questions Concerned with the Liquidation of the War, of the London International Assembly, League of Nations Union.

MAURY MAVERICK, formerly a Representative from Texas and Mayor of San Antonio, is now Director of the Government Division of the WPB.

MICHAEL YOUNG is a British journalist who is on the staff of Political and Economic Planning.

ERNEST C. OBERHOLTZER is a publicist in Minneapolis who has devoted his life to the preservation of forests in that area.

GAETANO SALVEMINI is co-author, with George La Piana, of "What to Do with Italy."

HARVEY BREIT is the author of a volume of verse, "There Falls Tom Fool," and has contributed to Poetry, Twice-a-Year, New Directions and other periodicals.

NICOLA CHIAROMONTE is an Italian writer, now a political refugee in the United States. He left Italy in 1934, and lived in France until 1941, where he was connected with the "Guistizia e Liberta" group.

RICHARD H. ROVERE, managing editor of Common Sense, was formerly on the staff of The Nation.

DAVID T. BAZELON is a free-lance writer now living in New York City.

ARCA
AMERICAN RUSSIAN CULTURAL ASSOCIATION
PRESENTS an Illustrated Lecture
THE THEATER IN SOVIET RUSSIA
By PROF. H. W. L. DANA
SUNDAY, NOV. 21st—8:30 P.M. ADMISSION $1.10 (Incl. tax)
For Aid to Russian War Orphans
200 WEST 57th STREET, NEW YORK CIRCLE 5-5377

Add a Language To Your Assets by LINGUAPHONE

In War, in Peace, ability to speak another language is an asset which will tip the scales in your favor . . . open new opportunities, earn promotion.

Speak ITALIAN, SPANISH, PORTUGUESE, RUSSIAN, POLISH, NORWEGIAN, FRENCH, GERMAN, JAPANESE or any of 20 other languages

Quickly, easily, correctly by LINGUAPHONE Ear-Eye METHOD

This amazingly simple and delightful way to learn to speak any of 29 languages in your own home is the work of 150 of the foremost language teachers of famous universities.

Endorsed by educational authorities, Linguaphone is used by Army, Navy, Flying, Signal, Medical Corps and other services; by 14,000 schools, colleges and by more than one million home-study students. Do not confuse Linguaphone Ear-Eye Method with any other.

Send for FREE book.
Call for FREE Demonstration.

LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE
86 R.C.A. Building, New York (20), N. Y.

LITERARY ADVISER

MARY DOUGLAS. Experienced Literary Adviser. Criticism, editing, revision, research. Theses, articles, novels, books. 430 West 119th St., New York City 27. N. Y. Telephone: UN 4-0400.

PERSONAL

YOUNG WOMAN ARTIST wishes to discuss the relative merits of classic and modern art with artists and esthetes. Address: Box 404, The New Republic.

WANTED TO BUY

LINGUAPHONE. Any language, any make. Indicate condition, language, number of records and books. LANGUAGE, Room 1203, 18 East 41st St., N. Y. C.

LITERARY SERVICE

TREATISES, RESEARCH PAPERS, SPEECHES. Special Articles, reviews, promptly prepared to requirements of busy professionals. Our extensive experience available at moderate rates, with assurance of scholarly serviceable result. AUTHORS RESEARCH BUREAU, 516 Fifth Avenue, New York.

ORDER YOUR BOOKS — ALL BOOKS — mailed anywhere in the U. S. A.

POSTAGE FREE

from NEW REPUBLIC BOOKS
40 East 49th Street New York 17, N. Y.

OUR MEN NEED ★ BOOKS ★

SEND ALL YOU CAN SPARE

That book you've enjoyed — pass it along to a man in uniform. Leave it at the nearest collection center or public library for the 1943

VICTORY BOOK CAMPAIGN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED